

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR NOVEMBER, 1826.

Art. I. *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans: with its Causes from the Earliest Period, and its Consequences to the Present Time.* Translated from the French of A. Thierry. 3 vols. 8vo. pp. 1519. Price 1l. 16s. London, 1825.

IT is high time for the men of England to look about them, unless they mean to yield to the writers of France a superiority which, though they are as yet far from having reached, they are evidently straining every nerve to attain. In poetical composition they will always fail, until they revive the poetical dialect of their ancestors; but their language is well suited to historical record, and their habits of thinking and research seem now to have taken that right direction which has been hitherto wanting to their efforts in this department of literature. Though they cannot, as yet, be said to range abreast with such men as Hallam and Sharon Turner, they are some strides in advance of Mr. Roscoe and Dr. Southey. They seem, however, judging from the recent example of Mignet, and the immediate instance of M. Thierry, to have an injurious propensity to the assumption of some favourite and pervading theory, specious indeed, and possibly true, but not by any means so clearly established as to justify its unqualified adoption. To his guiding principle, there can indeed be no objection, and he has, by a steady observance of its influence, given a powerful, though frequently painful effect to his narrative. In all national conflicts, he is the advocate of the conquered party;—*victa Cadoni* might have been his motto. He never suffers himself to be dazzled by the false brilliancy of military fame, nor to be turned aside from his sympathy with the oppressed by the 'pomp, pride, and circumstance' of successful warfare. All this is as it should be; but in some of his minor details, he seems to maintain too exclusively, the principle of nationality, and to attribute insurrections of a partial and local kind, to a generous impatience of the foreign yoke. Still, whatever of

justice there may be in this criticism, it cannot interfere with the general merits of the work, and we can cordially congratulate the readers of history, whether they may be of the investigating class or of the superficial order, on the appearance of an historical essay at once original and deeply interesting.

The leading details of the present work relate to the Norman conquest; but these are introduced by a brief, though spirited summary of the previous history of England, and followed by a view of the subsequent periods of our annals. With respect to the main series of transactions, it takes in, *first*, the events included between the dates of 1066, in October of which year the battle of Hastings was fought, and 1070, when all the centres of resistance were crushed. *Secondly*, it passes on to the 'political invasion,' or the systematic attempts to disorganize the conquered nation, which terminated, in 1076, with 'the execution of the last chief of Saxon race, and the sentence of degradation passed upon the last bishop of that race.' The *third* period, closing in 1086, was marked by the efforts of the conqueror to reduce to settled order the state of things thus accomplished. The *fourth* includes the civil wars which took place among the victors quarrelling for the spoil, and ends in 1152, at the establishment of Henry, son of the empress Matilda, on the Anglo-Norman throne. The *fifth*, terminating in the early part of the 13th century, is distinguished by the foreign wars of Henry the Second, and Richard the First.

It will be seen from this frame-work, that M. Thierry has not been content with writing history in the turnpike-road style, but that he has contemplated events with a discriminating eye, and that he has exercised at least a vigorous and decided judgement on the events which passed in review before him. A more interesting period he could hardly have chosen, since it required for its full and distinct treatment, that the historian should unravel the complicated transactions connected with the early history of Europe, and trace the origin, the enterprises, and the settlement of the various tribes of emigrant savages which, pouring in from the north in successive inundations, made themselves masters of the regions of the south. This, the most difficult part of his task, is, in our view, the most valuable and ably executed portion of M. Thierry's labours. He has examined for himself the primary authorities, and examined every collateral source of illustration. The chronicler and the troubadour, the ballad-maker and the annalist, have supplied him with materials; and he has, so far as was compatible with the general character of his work, adopted their style and manner, where it might be applicable to the immediate subject. He has rightly discarded the prevalent affect-

tation of adjusting the composition of history by classical models; and it has a very singular, and we are tempted to say, a very picturesque effect, to find the high-sounding and latinized names of the leaders of hordes of barbarians, translated back into their native dialects. For *Merovicus*, we have *Mere-wig*; *Hlod-wig* displaces *Clovis*; and *Charles Martel* comes upon us under the appalling designation of *Karl the Forge-hammer*. In the following extract, our readers will hardly recognise the history of the conversion and baptism of the Merovingian Clovis, the real founder of the French monarchy.

‘The portion of the territory of Gaul occupied by the Franks, extended from the Rhine to the Somme. The tribe which had advanced the furthest to the south and west, was that of the *Sicambri* or *sons of Mere-wig*; so called from the name of one of their ancient chiefs, renowned for his bravery, and venerated by the whole people as a common ancestor. At the head of the descendants of *Mere-wig* was a young man named *Lot-wig*, who was ambitious, avaricious, and cruel. The Gaulish bishops visited and addressed their messages to him; and some of them became very complaisant domestics in his household, which, in their Roman language, they styled the *royal court*. The barbarian was, at first, but little sensible to their flatteries, and plundered the churches and the lands of the clergy as before; but a precious vessel carried off by the Franks from the great cathedral of Rheims, attached him by the ties of interest, and soon by those of friendship, to a prelate more able or more fortunate than the rest. Under the auspices of Remigius, bishop of Rheims, all events seem to concur in forwarding the great plan of the priests of Gaul. First, by a marvellous chance, the pagan whom it was desired to convert to the Christian faith, married the only woman professing Christianity according to the Romish dogmas, that was then to be found among the whole Teutonic race. The caresses of the believing wife (as the histories of the time express it) softened by degrees the heart of the unbelieving husband. In a battle fought against a German people who wished to follow the Franks into Gaul, and take a part of their conquest, *Lot-wig*, whose soldiers were giving way, invoked the god of *Lot-hilde*, his wife, and promised to believe in him on condition of his gaining the battle. He gained it, and kept his word.

‘The example of the man in power, the presents of *Lot-hilde* and the bishops, and perhaps the attraction of novelty, effected the conversion of a number of the Frank soldiers, amounting, say the historians, to three thousand; but they confess that these wished to be baptized in order to please their chief, before they knew what baptism was. The ceremony was performed at Rheims. All which the arts of Rome, destined shortly to perish in Gaul, could yet furnish of brilliancy and splendor, was lavishly employed in decorating the triumph of the bishops: the streets were adorned with carpets; blinds of various colours, stretching from roof to roof, intercepted the glare and heat of the sun, as at the games of the circus; the pavement was

strewn with flowers, and perfumes arose in abundance. The bishop of Rheims, in vestments covered with gold, walked beside the fierce Sicamber, whom he called his spiritual son. "Father," said the latter, wondering at such pomp, "is this then that kingdom of heaven to which thou hast promised to lead me?"

The history of Britain, previously to the Saxon invasions, is exhibited with M. Thierry's accustomed skill, and he displays a conversance with English literature very unusual in a Frenchman. The struggles between the natives and the invaders, are so described as to awaken all our sympathy in behalf of the former; and the historian is not negligent in that part of his task which required him to expose the eagerness and subtlety of the Church of Rome, in the pursuit of gold and power. His pages, though without intention on the part of M. T., who makes no reference to the individual, give an annihilating answer to the misrepresentations of Lingard, who has sacrificed himself in a hopeless cause, and whose history will be hereafter cited as one of the most marvellous specimens extant of prejudice and Jesuitical perversion. The *man* might have written—for he has evidently enough both of learning and of ability—a History of England that would have supplied the deficiency that still exists in our literature; but the *Romish priest* prevailed, and he gave up fair and lasting fame for spurious and temporary reputation. It has been well observed, that ten years hence, his book will be forgotten.

It should seem that, on the Continent at least, infidelity is now assuming a new, and we will admit, a more respectable form. There seems to be a disposition among the better sort of free-thinkers—a class including a large proportion of the men of letters—to pay a vague and nominal homage to Christianity. They appear to allow, under specific restrictions, its superior pretensions as the guide of life and the foundation of general morals; nor do they object to its adoption as an ultimate appeal, a final referee in cases of conscience, as well as in all that concerns the coherence and well-being of society. The fact is, that these individuals are at deadly war with Popery, as a system tending to enslave the mind and debase the heart; and they feel the advantage of a rallying point, a higher ground, where they may take their stand, and avail themselves of effective weapons in a conflict which they feel to involve, at least, the best earthly interests of man. Not that we are to reckon on these men as cordial allies. They are enlightened as far as this world is concerned, and they will join us in our plans for bettering the condition of society, or in our advocacy of more popular systems of political administration; but, in our character of religionists, they can afford us no kinder feel-

ing than that of courteous contempt and friendly wonder that people, in other respects so liberal and well-judging, can yield to the influences of vulgar fanaticism. M. Thierry seems to belong to this sect; he detests popery as a scheme for deteriorating and enslaving the very intellects of men; and, well aware that society cannot exist without the higher sanctions of religion, he consents to patronize Christianity in its better forms, as, on the whole, not incompatible with liberal institutions. We regret that such men cannot be wholly on our side, and that, instead of this half-hearted fellowship, he does not become with us one and indivisible. But our sorrow is for them, not for ourselves nor for our cause. They are accomplishing an important task by aiding in the exposure of unhallowed usurpations; and for the rest, we are satisfied in committing results to the disposal of unerring wisdom. The following paragraph may serve to shew the nature of M. Thierry's sentiments on these subjects.

'At an early period of the Saxon invasion, there came into Britain two preachers named Lupus and Germain of Auxerre. These men combated the Pelagian doctrines, not by logical arguments, but by texts and quotations. "How," said they, "can it be maintained, that man is born without original guilt, when it is expressly written, *I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me?*" This sort of proof was not without its power over some gross intellects; and Germain d'Auxerre succeeded in restoring in Britain some degree of what the orthodox called *the honour of divine grace*. It must be said, to the credit of this man, that his preaching to the Britons was the consequence rather of his own personal zeal and conviction, than of a mission from the pontifical authority.'

We suspect that M. Thierry states the matter somewhat too broadly, when he ventures to affirm, that the 'orthodox' assailed Pelagianism, 'not by logical arguments.' We are not aware that the Anti-Pelagians have been at any time backward in the appeal to logic; and we dare say that the worthy Germanus of Auxerre stood as stoutly to his arms, as the most pertinacious wrangler among his opponents. But we must confess ourselves especially puzzled by M. Thierry's sneer at the production of Bible-texts, on an occasion where they were peculiarly appropriate. They appealed to Scripture as to a common and infallible authority in matters of controversy; and we must plead guilty to the imputed grossness of intellect, since the 'quotation' referred to seems to us not only very much in point, but sufficiently decisive of the question.

The various conflicts between the Britons and the Saxons, with the successive visitations and final prevalence of the latter, are interestingly narrated, and the details are marked by

an attention to costume and topographical accuracy, altogether remarkable in a Frenchman writing about England. The Danish incursions are distinctly described, and the alternations of victory and defeat which marked the struggle between the predatory Scandinavians and the Anglo Saxons, are detailed in a very clear and interesting manner. All this, however, we must dismiss with brief reference, and pass forward to the principal subject. But, before we enter on the subsequent portion, we shall extract a paragraph which not only claims insertion here as in its proper place, but will explain and justify the feeling in which M. Thierry has composed his history, and to which we adverted in the former part of the present article.

‘The recital of the misfortunes of the Anglo-Saxon people, subjugated and oppressed by a people of different language and origin, is now to be commenced. That race of men, therefore, will now claim the interest of the historian, for it will be the suffering race: in the same manner as the suffering race of the Britons has interested him in the preceding pages. This is a privilege acquired by every nation, by every generation of human beings, from the moment that another generation, having neither the claims of justice to enforce, nor the rights of nature to vindicate, against the former, but whom the mad passion for rule, the thirst of gain, or the caprice of hate has called to arms, rise and march over the bodies of men who have never marched over those of their forefathers. Without being the less impartial, and without in any degree perverting the truth of facts, we may be allowed to pity the fate, in past ages as well as in the present, of men and of nations become victims of injustice and violence. This is no more than is due to equity and humanity, and if the unfortunate are sacred to their contemporaries, they are equally so to history.’

The chieftain who ultimately expelled the Danes, and re-established the Saxon supremacy, was the celebrated Godwin; a man of whom it has been the fashion to assert and to believe, that he was at once faithless and ferocious. In the narrative of M. Thierry, he is the hero of his age and country, the cautious, but firm and enterprising assertor of the independence of England; and, although the matter may not be quite so self-evident as it appears in the pages before us, we are disposed, on the whole, to admit his representation as substantially correct. This illustrious Saxon was the son of a shepherd whose name was Ulf-noth, and his original employment was the care of his father's flocks. Having rendered a most important service to a Danish chief, he was raised to military command, and in course of time became rich and powerful. During the reign of Hard-knut—the Hardicanute of our histories—he was accused, apparently on very insufficient evidence, of having occasioned, by his treachery, the death of Elf-red, half brother of the king, and

was compelled to purchase immunity at an enormous price. The rule of Hard-knut pressed heavily on the English people. The Danes lorded it over the Saxons with systematic rapacity and intolerable insolence, while the latter cherished in secret, the stern purpose of revenge. On the death of the tyrant, the feelings of hatred burst forth into open demonstration.

God-win and his son Her-ald, or Har-old according to the Saxon orthography, raised the standard this time for the pure independence of the country, against every Dane, king or pretender, chief or soldier. The Danes, driven rapidly northward, and chased from town to town, took to their ships, and landed with diminished numbers, on the shores of their ancient country. On their return home, they related a tale of treason, the romantic circumstances of which may be found detailed in a manner equally fabulous in the histories of various nations. They said, that Har-old, the son of God-win, had invited the principal of them to a great banquet, to which the Saxons came armed, and attacked them unawares.

It was, however, no surprise of this kind, but an open war, which put an end to the Danish dominion in England. God-win and his son, at the head of the insurgent nation, played the most distinguished part in this national war. In the moment of deliverance, the whole care of public affairs was confided to the son of Ulf-noth the herdsman, who, by rescuing his country from the hands of the foreigners, had accomplished the singular fortune which he commenced by saving a foreigner and an enemy from the hands of his countrymen. God-win, had he wished it, might have been made king of England; very few suffrages would have been refused him: but he chose rather to point out to the English people one who was a stranger to the recent events, who had no enemies, and was envied by none,—one who was inoffensive to all by his obscurity, and interesting in the eyes of all from his misfortunes; this was Ed-ward, the second son of Ethel-red, the man whose brother he was accused of having betrayed and brought to an untimely end. At the instigation of the Chief of the West, a great council, held at Gillingham, decided that a national message should be sent to Ed-ward in Normandy, to announce to him that the people had made him king, on condition of his bringing only a small number of Normans in his train.

We are willing to acquiesce in this view of these important transactions, precisely because it is the most favourable; and we know not why the historian should be always solicitous to exhibit his characters under the least amiable and attractive aspect. Unhappily, indeed, human nature exhibits more average features of depravity than of goodness; and a very different, as well as, perhaps, a more plausible representation of all these circumstances might easily be given. Godwin might, probably, have been made king of England, but he must have worn a bloody diadem, and maintained by the sword a doubtful dominion. His servile origin would have indisposed the

haughty; his singular good-fortune might incline the envious to cabal; and to a shrewd and cool calculator, the enjoyment of real power would be more gratifying than the mere trappings of royalty, with an uncertain authority and a disputed throne. It is not improbable that he might anticipate the entire management of national affairs under the nominal reign of a monarch of feeble character; and he took a step which bade fair to confirm his political influence, when he effected the marriage of his daughter Edith with the weak and vacillating Edward.

However this may have been, the consequences, or at least the sequences of all these manœuvres were disastrous to the country. Edward, by his jealousies and weak compliances, prepared the way for the subjugation of the Anglo-Saxon race. Notwithstanding his pledge, his court was Norman, and his reign unpopular. 'The Almighty,' is the observation of Henry of Huntingdon, 'must have formed at the same time, two plans of destruction for the English race, and have been pleased to lay for them a sort of military ambuscade; for he let loose the Danes on one side, and on the other, carefully created and cemented the Norman alliance; so that if, by chance, we escaped from the open assaults of the Danes, the unforeseen cunning of the Normans might still be in readiness to surprise us.' Among the foreign visitors who were welcomed by the infatuated Edward, was William the Bastard, duke of Normandy, whose progress through the rich and flourishing towns and villages of England, probably inflamed the cupidity which afterwards incited him to the invasion of the land. In the mean time, the days of Godwin were drawing to a close. After many vicissitudes, he had succeeded in driving out the Normans, and in rendering the Saxon interest paramount; but the mind of the king had been indelibly impressed with the conviction that he was the murderer of young Elfred. This accusation

pursued the Saxon patriot to the hour of his death. One day, when seated at Edward's table, he suddenly fainted away; and this accident was the foundation of a romantic and very doubtful story, although it is repeated by several historians. They relate that one of the attendants, while filling a goblet, made a false step and stumbled, but saved himself from falling by the help of his other leg. "Ah!" said Godwin, laughing, to the king, "the brother came to help his brother." "No doubt," returned Edward, casting a significant glance at the Saxon, "the brother has need of his brother; and would to God that mine were still living!" "O king," exclaimed Godwin, "wherefore is it that the least remembrance of thy brother makes thee look with an evil eye on me? If I contributed, even indirectly, to his misfortune, may the God of heaven cause this mouthful of bread to choke me!" Godwin put the bread into his mouth, say the writers who relate this adventure, and was immediately suffocated. The truth is,

that his death was not so sudden; but that, having fallen from his seat, he was carried out of the apartment by two of his sons, Fostig and Gurth, and expired five days after. The accounts of all these events generally vary, as the writer happens to be of Norman or of English birth. "I constantly see before me," says an historian who lived within a century afterwards, "two roads—two opposite versions; and I wish my readers to be forewarned of the danger to which I am myself exposed."

Harold, Godwin's eldest son, succeeded to the chieftainship of his family, to his father's honours and influence, and to a larger share of the favour of Edward. He was a brave and high-spirited man, but singularly incautious; and almost every particular of his personal history tends to waken a strong interest in the fate of the individual, while we lament the very wantonness of self-exposure which ultimately effected his own destruction and the ruin of his country. The strange heedlessness which induced him, in opposition to King Edward's emphatic warning, to put himself in the hands of the crafty and unprincipled William; the impetuosity which, when the invasion took place, led him to confront the Norman army with greatly inferior forces; and the headstrong valour which carried him and his Saxon footmen, quitting the shelter of their entrenchments, in full career against the Norman chivalry; were all striking exemplifications of character, and successive pledges of ultimate defeat, in the struggle with an enemy brave as himself, and guided by a policy of which the generous Saxon took no account. Harold, contrary to the urgent entreaty of his brothers, risked all upon a single battle; and thenceforward, the Bastard and his ruffian followers ruled England with a rod of iron. Insurrections, whether on a large or a limited scale, served only to illustrate the desperate valour of the natives who, though sometimes victorious, could never make any permanent impression on the Norman strength.

'From the time that the conquest began to prosper, not young soldiers and old warlike chiefs alone, but whole families, men, women, and children, emigrated from Gaul to seek their fortunes in the country of the English. To the people on the other side of the channel, this country was like a land newly discovered, which they went to colonise. "Hoël the Breton," says an old record, "and his wife Celestine, came to the army of the Norman bastard, and received a gift from this same bastard, of the manor of Elinghall, with all its dependencies." One Guillaume (says another old record in rhyme) came into England with his wife Tifanie, his maid Manfas, and his dog Hardigras. Men who adventured together in the chances of the invasion, became sworn brothers in arms, and contracted fellowships in gain and loss, for life and death. Robert D'Oily and Roger d'Ivry came to the conquest as brethren leagued together by faith

and by oath. Their clothes and their arms were alike, and they shared together the lands which they conquered. Eude and Picot, Robert Marmion and Gaultier de Somerville, did the same. Jean de Courcy and Amaury de St. Florent swore their fraternity of arms in the church of Notre Dame at Rouen: they vowed to serve together, to live and die together, and to share together their pay and whatever they might gain by the sword. Others, at the moment of their departure, disposed of all that they possessed on that side the channel, that they might be the more determined to make themselves a new and more brilliant fortune. Thus it was that Geoffroy de Chaumont, son of Gidoïn, viscount of Blois, gave to his niece Denise all the lands which he possessed in the county of Blois, at Chaumont and Tours. "He departed for the conquest," says the historian, "and afterwards returned to Chaumont with an immense treasure, large sums of money, a great number of articles of rarity, and the titles of possession of more than one great and rich domain."

"Ignoble squires, impure vagabonds," say the contemporary writers, "disposed at their pleasure of young women of the best families, leaving them to weep and wish for death. Frantic wretches! they wondered at their own acts, and went mad with pride and astonishment at finding themselves so powerful, and having servants with greater wealth than their fathers had ever possessed. Whatever they had the will, they believed they had the right, to do; they shed blood in wantonness; they snatched the last morsel of bread from the mouths of the unfortunate; they seized every thing—money, goods, and land."

'One alone amongst all the warriors in the conqueror's train, claimed neither lands, nor gold, nor women; and would accept no part of the spoils of the vanquished: he was named Guilbert, son of Richard. He said that he had accompanied his lord into England, because such was his duty; that he was not to be tempted by stolen property, but would return into Normandy, to live on his own patrimony, which, though small, was lawful, and content with his own portion, would take nothing from others.'

The priests who came over in great numbers from Normandy, were not less profligate in their spoliations than their secular countrymen. They degraded the Saxon prelates and clergy, and ejected them from their benefices, without shame or remorse. Derision was added to barbarity, and insult to rapacity. There was, however, one honest and high-minded man, even among this crew of heartless hypocrites, to bear a stern and solemn protest against their atrocious proceedings. Guimand, a Norman monk, and a man of exemplary character, visited England at the invitation of William; but, in reply to the offer of high ecclesiastical dignity, he set before him the enormity of his conduct, refused to sanction his usurpations, and

rejected his splendid bribes with magnanimous indignation.—
‘Your England,’ said this holy and disinterested reprobator,
‘seems one vast prey; and I should dread to touch it for its
‘treasures, as I should to put my hands into a fire.’ But this
worthy had no imitators, and the selfish and grasping mur-
mured at a conscientiousness which covered their own felonies
with deeper infamy. The spoilers did not, indeed, enjoy their
prey altogether without disturbance. Frequent insurrections
took place; a kind of Guerilla warfare was kept up in many
parts of the kingdom; and to this period is to be referred the
origin of the popular ballads which commemorate the daring
achievements and hair-breadth ‘scapes of some gallant outlaw—
Robin Hood, Adam Bell, and Clym of the Clough. These men
‘took as much pride in the title of *outlaw*, as, in a free nation, is at-
tached to that of *citizen*. History names them not; she has passed
them over in silence: or, following the language of the legal acts de-
creed by the conquering race, she has branded them with epithets
which take from them all interest—with the names of *rebel*, *traitor*,
robber, *bandit*. But let us not be imposed on by these titles odious in
appearance: they are those which, in every country under foreign
subjection, have been borne by the few brave men who, while the rest
of their nation submitted to the chain, have taken up their abode in
the mountains and deserts, leaving the cities to the slaves. Such as
had not the courage to follow these brave men’s example, would ac-
company them with their wishes; and—to return to England—while
ordonnances drawn up in the French language were prescribing to
every inhabitant of the towns and villages, to track the outlaw—the
forester, like a wolf, and pursue him *with hue and cry* from hamlet to
hamlet, from hundred to hundred, English songs were circulating, in
honour of this enemy to the foreign power, whose treasury was said to
be the count’s purse, and his flock the king’s deer. The popular
poets of the time celebrated his victories, his combats, his stratagems,
against the self-styled guardians of the public safety—how he had
tired out the viscount’s men and horses in pursuit—how he had taken
the bishop, ransomed him for a thousand marks, and made him dance
a measure in his pontifical habits.’

It is satisfactory to know that, in the midst of his vast ac-
quisitions, the author of these devastations was a miserable
man, and that the mighty Conqueror, the lord of fifteen hundred
confiscated manors, the chief of the Norman chivalry, and the
master of a realm of slaves, trembled on his blood-cemented
throne. When he sat amid his warriors and prelates, his looks
were frowning and gloomy, nor could the golden diadem which
encircled his forehead, tranquillize his apprehensions. He was
agitated by fears of change. He had no confidence in the at-
tachment of his Normans, nor was the debased condition of his
English serfs a sufficient security against his dread of a re-
action.

'The human heads on which he trod, were in his eyes a ground not sufficiently firm and secure: he tormented himself about his own future years and the fate of his children; and put questions concerning his presentiments to men reputed wise, in an age when divination was a part of wisdom. A Norman poet, almost contemporary, represents him seated in the midst of his English and Norman priests, and soliciting of them, with puerile importunity, a decisive exposition of the fate of his posterity. At every word that fell from their lips, this great conqueror trembled before them, as an Anglo-Saxon serf or citizen would have trembled in his presence.'

Long did the remembrance of these destructive visitations rankle in the breasts of Englishmen. Two hundred years afterwards, a monastic writer ascribed the unequal distribution of property, and the prevalence of mutual dislike between the higher and lower orders, to the still subsisting distinction of race; and so late as the sixteenth century, an explorer of antiquity represented the artizans and peasantry of England, as a class unjustly deprived of its inheritance. Nay, M. Thierry seems to consider our nobility, even in the present day, as little better than heirs of Norman spoliation. He styles the middle and lower classes, 'the living representatives of the old English and of old England,' and intimates that the *people*—reviewers of course included—have the advantage of a more ancient lineage, and, as possessing a prior claim, are the rightful lords of the soil. We can, of course, have no objection to this scheme, if it can be quietly established; and we shall be extremely happy to find that, on the score of our Saxon descent, established by our lack of a Norman title, we have an admitted claim to a decent segment of King William's fifteen hundred manors.

The reigns of the Red King and Henry his brother, afforded little respite to the Saxons; but the wars between Stephen of Blois and the Empress Matilda, gave them partial intermission. The reign of Henry the Second was remarkable for the singular quarrel between the King and Thomas-à-Becket; a contest in which the lower orders took a keen interest, since they identified with their own, the cause of the first English archbishop, subsequent to the conquest. Respecting Becket's personal motives, we apprehend that it is in vain to seek for any other impulse than that of pride and obstinacy. His opposition to Henry was distinguished by no appeal to sound principle or to magnanimous sentiments; it was simply a struggle for power, in which violence at last prevailed.

'To the cause of Becket,—whatever it might be, and whatever might be his impulse—whether ambition or love of resistance, or stubbornness in his determinations, or conviction of religious duty, or

a dim and ill-defined consciousness of national hostility, or a mixture of all these passions and dispositions,—was joined—perhaps without his knowledge, but at least independently of him—a cause more worthy than his own—the cause of those men who were enslaved by the forefathers of the king, of whom he had declared himself the adversary; and this it is which raises this great intrigue to a higher rank in history, than the ordinary disputes between the crown and the mitre.

In reviewing the history of these times, it is impossible not to be struck with the awful prevalence of perjury. Oaths of the most solemn kind, enforced by sanctions the most appalling, were broken with a levity and frequency which shew how fatally the disastrous system of Rome had operated on the consciences of men. The very fact, that dispensation from the obligation of a sworn pledge might be purchased, or that the guilt of its most profligate violation was to be absolved at a stipulated price, had of itself a demoralizing influence which inevitably led to so melancholy a result. It should seem too, that the fear of canonical visitation in the form of an interdict, has been somewhat over-charged by historians. There are numerous instances on record of ineffectual menace in this way; and the clergy would not unfrequently be incautious enough to betray the utter contempt in which they held them.

In no part of his history does M. Thierry remit his determined hostility to the ancient nobility of Europe. He cites, for the purpose of illustrating the price which 'most European' nations have paid for the establishment of those privileged 'families which are still decorated with the title of *noble*,' a curious document of the fourteenth century, in which Donald O'Neyl, king of Ulster, with his chiefs and people, appeals to the pope against the intolerable exactions and oppressions of the conquerors of Ireland. He gives a brief but fearful detail of the miseries that the subjugated were compelled to suffer, and pledges himself and his nation to a 'war unto death' against the tyrants of their country. Nor has this menace been an idle one; neither is it yet forgotten.

'In our own days, blood has flowed in Ireland on account of the old quarrel of the conquest. The period in futurity when this quarrel shall be terminated, it is impossible to foresee; and aversion for England, its government, its manners, and its language, is still the native passion of the Irish race. From the day of the invasion, the will of that race of men has been constantly opposed to the will of its masters; it has detested what they have loved, and loved what they have detested. They, whose long misfortunes were in great measure caused by the ambition of the popes, rushed into the arms of popery with a sort of fury, so soon as England had freed herself

from it. This unconquerable obstinacy,—this lengthened remembrance of departed liberty—this faculty of preserving and nourishing, through ages of physical misery and suffering, the thought of that which is no more,—of never despairing of a constantly-vanquished cause, for which many generations have successively, and in vain, perished in the field, and by the executioner,—is, perhaps, the most extraordinary and the greatest example that a people has ever given.'

M. Thierry never abates of this sympathy with the oppressed, and this righteous censure of the oppressor. When detailing the circumstances attending the disgraceful seizure of Richard the First by the Austrian Liepold, he comments with becoming indignation on the readiness which the princes of Austria have manifested to consign to their dungeons 'foreigners illustrious either by rank or character;' and reprobates those acts of violence perpetrated against 'men whose only crime was the having loved their country's liberty.'

There remains one question to put, and to answer, before we dismiss these valuable and interesting volumes. Was the Norman conquest, or was it not, productive of ultimate advantage to the country which, in the first instance, it so grievously scourged? To this question, M. Thierry does not enable us to give a satisfactory reply, but, if we understand him rightly, he seems disposed to derive from it much of what is advantageous in the present state of the British constitution. If this be really his sentiment, we differ from him altogether. England, when the men of Normandy violated her soil, was wealthy and happy; and the system of society was favourable to liberty. Of all this they obliterated every vestige, and in exchange for those blessings, they entailed upon us a complicated and injurious scheme of jurisprudence, full of subtlety and chicanery, and well suited to the proverbially litigious spirit of the Normans, though entirely adverse to the simplicity of the Anglo-Saxon institutions. That this state of things should, in an enlightened age, be still permitted to subsist, is among the most astonishing of anomalies. Cheapness, promptitude, and accessibility, are qualities without which substantial justice cannot exist; and if these are to be found in our judicial code, we have not read it rightly. The greater part of what is good in our constitution, we inherit from our Saxon ancestors: the rest is Norman.

We are happy to say that M. Thierry has found an adequate translator. The work is not merely *done into English*; it is, as all translations should be, made native.

Art. II. *History of the Crusades against the Albigenses in the Thirteenth Century.* From the French of J. C. Sismondi de Sismondi. With an Introductory Essay by the Translator. 8vo. pp. 206. Price 8s. London. 1826.

IN the broad page of the history of nations, the story of the Church of Christ wears the humble appearance of a mere episode. It is but occasionally, and as by accident, that the concerns and progress of the spiritual kingdom come into notice; and then it is generally as clashing with the kingdoms of this world. Christianity seldom appears on the theatre of events, but either as a sufferer or in disguise, as a heretic or as a martyr. Her footsteps are chiefly to be traced by her blood, by the light of the fires kindled by her persecutors, or by the more equivocal traces afforded by the dust and clamour of religious controversy.

The history of the Albigensic and Waldensic Christians forms one of the most interesting and affecting episodes of this description. It is interesting in many points of view,—as a deeply tragic tale, as connected with the revival of literature, as an era in the progress of religious liberty, and as illustrating the policy of the Court of Rome. It is on the last of these grounds that the Translator of the present volume has been induced to bring before the English public this portion of M. Sismondi's *History of France*.

Although only an extract from a larger work, yet, it embraces an entire and, to a considerable degree, independent subject, giving a view of a series of interesting events, issuing in a catastrophe of great importance to the cause of civil and religious liberty, and of lasting influence upon the destinies of Europe. It commences with the thirteenth century, and comprises a period of about forty years, detailing the progress in civilization, liberty, and religion, of the fine countries in the south of France, and the destruction of that liberty and civilization, the devastation and ruin of those countries, and the extinction of those early efforts for religious reformation, through the power and policy of the Church of Rome. It relates the establishment of the Inquisition, and the provisions by which that merciless tribunal was adapted to become for ages the grand engine of domination to that ambitious and persecuting power. And it marks the complete establishment of civil and ecclesiastical despotism, by the surrender of all those states, with their rights and liberties, to the dominion and control of the French monarch under the direction of the Roman pontiff.

Into the particular views and opinions of the Translator, we feel little inclination to enter. That the principles of the Court of Rome are unchanged, is sufficiently manifest, notwithstanding the mild and enlightened policy of the late amiable Pius VII.

and his liberal-minded minister, Cardinal Gonsalvi. In Austria, in France, in Spain, and in Ireland, the priesthood maintain the same intolerant claims, and demonstrate the same hostility to light and freedom, that they ever did. The spiritual claims of the Church of Rome, from the Pope down to the humblest priest, are essentially incompatible with the rights of conscience, being founded on a tremendous usurpation of the prerogatives of Christ. We put quite out of consideration, the disputed right to release from the obligation of an oath. The doctrines of auricular confession, of penance, and of purgatory, together with the mysterious power on which the sacerdotal domination is founded, of 'making the body of Christ,'—these cardinal articles of Romanism form a threefold chain of enthrallment which hold alike the intellect and the conscience in deplorable and fatal bondage. He that binds himself in this thin web of sorcery, is much in the condition in which Southey places the son of Hodeirah in his wild tale of *Thalaba*, when he has consented to twine round his own hands the magic thread.

' The thread is small, the thread is fine ;
But he must be a stronger than thee,
Who can break this thread of mine.'

With regard to the charge of persecution, however, it may be fairly retorted, that every national church has persecuted. The Church of Rome, the Church of England, the Church of Geneva, have all exercised the assumed right to punish heretics and schismatics. If the principles upon which the crusade against the Albigenses was undertaken, has never been renounced by any authentic or official act of the Romish Church, neither has any official disclaimer been issued by the Church of England, of the atrocities committed by her prelates in the reigns of the Tudors and the Stuarts. It is absurd to ask for this. Were the crime of having persecuted and the disposition still to persecute, all that could be alleged against the Romish Church, nothing more would be necessary than that the ecclesiastical power should be, in every state and kingdom, subordinated to the civil and constitutional authorities, legislative and juridical, in the same manner as it is in this country. Where the laws govern, and the people are a party to those laws, there the Church cannot persecute.

Ecclesiastical power is a pure despotism, underived, irresponsible, recognising in its subjects no representative or elective rights, admitting of no popular control, and of no appeal except to itself. The theory of this power is every where the same : it is that of a theocracy. The Court of Rome has never claimed more or other power than did the English

Star-chamber; and the Canons of the English Church exhibit the organic remains of that same leviathan which once lived and raged in this country. Protestantism, released from Law, would still prove, as in days gone by, a Popish persecutor. In Ireland, its very laws were a disgrace upon the name of law, a code of blood and horrible injustice. On the Continent, Presbyterians have vied with Roman Catholics in intolerance and persecution. Popery and Protestantism, in this point of view, are distinctions of little force and meaning; and it is alike unwise and unfair, to rest any argument in favour of the latter upon so slender and doubtful a foundation. We owe something, it is true, to the "Defender of the Faith," who first made the Civil Magistrate the head of the clergy in this country; but the subjection of the Church to parliamentary and constitutional control, was not effected at the Reformation; and it is to this, not to our having a Protestant Church, that we owe our religious freedom.

The Editor of this volume remarks, very justly, that 'we hold our liberties only by the tenure of our power to maintain them.' He seems to forget, however, whence that power was derived, or what are its securities. It is a power that was wrested, as to its origin, by Roman Catholic barons from a Popish king, and as to its consummation, was extorted by a Protestant people from a Protestant sovereign and a Protestant hierarchy. Protestantism cannot secure that power: its only safeguards are the Constitutional rights which are vested in the British Commons, and their being the representatives of the people.

It is truly astonishing, that this broad and palpable distinction between the spiritual domination of the Church of Rome and its political character, should be so little understood. Its policy may vary; it may or may not be politically intolerant, according, not merely to its ability, but to the views and private feelings of its rulers. And when it does oppress and persecute, it acts as a political power, in the exercise of the same right that other churches and sovereigns have claimed to punish heresy and schism. Bishop Bonner, Archbishop Cranmer, and John Calvin persecuted to death on the same principles of arbitrary intolerance. Ganganelli and Pius VII. were opposed to persecution. But the power to persecute can be exercised only when the magistracy is the creature of the Church, and the laws are framed by the priesthood, not by the people. The exclusion of the priesthood from the legislature and the magistracy is the only effectual means of totally depriving the Church of this power, the propensity to exercise which, when possessed, is common to all churches and indi-

viduals of all parties, because it is deeply rooted in our nature.

But Popery, deprived of all political power, is still a baneful and degrading despotism. Why is so much dread expressed as to its regaining its political power, and so little said of its character as a spiritual usurpation? Why go back to the days of the Albigenses to prove, that Popery is the unchangeable enemy of the best interests of man?—an enemy, however, less to be dreaded by those against whom it draws the sword and kindles its fires, than by those whom it holds as willing captives in worse than Egyptian bondage,—the bondage of the heart and conscience. Follow out the three doctrines of Confession, Penance, and Purgatory, connected as they are with the mysterious attributes, and spiritual power, and celibacy of the priest—doctrines interwoven with the whole system of Popery, and which can neither be disclaimed nor dissevered from it,—follow them out into their legitimate and unavoidable practical consequences,—and it will be easy to shew, that a corruption of morals as well as of every correct principle of religion must be the result. The tendency which Christianity has to raise the standard of morals, must be neutralized by a system which is diametrically opposite to its distinguishing doctrines. As a system of idolatry, Popery, in its grosser forms, differs scarcely in any thing from heathenism; the Virgin, Saint Peter, and Saint Dominick being the *Mater Dea*, the Jupiter, and the Moloch of the Christianized pantheon. But, independently of this, the Atonement of Christ, the Justification of the sinner through his blood, the efficacy of his mediation, and the Scriptural doctrine of Sanctification, are not merely obscured, but contradicted by the system which authorizes the sale and purchase of prayers and masses, of pardons and indulgencies, which substitutes penal commutation for justification through faith, and makes hell redeemable, like the land-tax, by penny a week subscriptions to a purgatorian society.

If Popery were perfectly tolerant,—not a lamb in clothing only, but in nature, it would not be one whit less detestable. Its persecuting propensity may be aggravated by the nature of its spiritual claims; and when those claims are united to political power, they form an engine of the more diabolical malignity, such as the Inquisition fully realized. But still, this is not a necessary combination; it is, in a sense, an accident of Popery, and does not enter into its essence. To insist upon this, therefore, is to take the weakest ground of argument. And we very much fear, that the clamour for and against what is called Catholic emancipation, the No Popery cry, has had

the effect of keeping out of view what ought to be uppermost in our thoughts as Christians, and most prominent in our discussions as Protestants, the distinctive character of Popery as a spiritual domination and an awful heresy. It has been regarded with anger and with fear, rather than with an enlightened and philanthropic deprecation and abhorrence; and recourse has been too often had to carnal weapons,—pains, and penalties, and restrictions,—as if the combat were with flesh and blood, rather than with spiritual wickednesses, impalpable to any but the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.

The hatred of persecution in any and every shape, and by whomsoever exercised, is, however, a salutary sentiment which it is most desirable to cherish; and so far, the design of the present publication has our cordial approval. Independently of this, the history has attractions which will recommend the volume to the perusal of our readers; and with a view to excite their interest in its contents, we shall attempt a brief outline of the story.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, France still consisted of four distinct principalities, marked by the same difference of language and national character which still subsists among the provinces of the neighbouring peninsula. These were, Northern or Walloon France, or what might be denominated France Proper, the dominions of Philip Augustus; British or Western France, which included Aquitaine; Germanic France, consisting of Lorraine and Burgundy; and Southern France, comprising all the countries in which the Provencal was spoken, and which were more or less dependent on the king of Aragon. Languedoc, Provence, Catalonia, and the neighbouring countries bordering on the Mediterranean, were peopled by an industrious and intelligent race, addicted to commerce, and possessed of an infant literature, while the greater part of Europe was still in the grossest barbarism. Their cities were numerous and flourishing; their forms of municipal government nearly republican. They had consuls chosen by the people, and possessed the privilege of forming *communes*, which rendered them nearly equal to the Italian Republics, with which they traded. Into the causes which led to this prosperity, M. Sismondi does not appear to enter. We have slightly adverted to them in a former article.* There can be no doubt that the commerce of the Levant had served to give the stimulus to commercial enterprise and manufacturing

* Eclectic Rev. April, 1826. Art. *Lays of the Minnesingers, &c.*

industry in these countries, and the power and privileges of the municipalities were the natural consequence of increasing wealth. The political strength of the British Commons, to which we may trace our liberties and rights, had a similar origin. Industry and wealth can exist only under the protection of equal laws securing the property of those who, while engaged in its acquisition, are not in a posture or condition to defend their possessions. Hence, an equitable legislation has constantly connected itself with mercantile interests, and religious freedom has followed upon the establishment of civil liberty. In the middle ages, Provence is said to have contained more free persons than any other part of France. The superior political institutions enjoyed by the states of Southern France would naturally render them the asylum of refugees from all quarters. Accordingly, great numbers of Jews are stated to have found shelter in the commercial capitals, while fugitives of all descriptions from Spain, Italy, and Northern France, countries torn by war or exposed to ecclesiastical oppression, must have greatly swelled the population of those provinces. The fires of persecution had been kindled at Turin, the scene of Bishop Claude's apostolic labours, and in the neighbouring cities, as early as the tenth century. About the middle of the eleventh, Cologne witnessed the martyrdom of several heretics, respecting whose sentiments there is no room to question that they were substantially Scriptural. In the twelfth century, the Cathari or Puritans abounded in Germany, Flanders, Lorraine, Southern France, Savoy, and Milan; and a small company of German refugees found their way from Gascony into England, where they were cruelly persecuted, and, after undergoing a public whipping and other penal severities, perished with cold and hunger. Galdinus, archbishop of Milan, who died in 1173, distinguished himself as an unrelenting persecutor of the Cathari. By the council of Tours, held in 1163, princes were exhorted to imprison all heretics in their dominions, and to confiscate their effects. Still, the persecution does not appear to have been general. M. Sismondi indeed states, that 'the adoption of the reformed opinions did not immediately announce itself as a heresy.'

' Since many prelates of the Church had given the example of such reform, those who followed them, did not consider themselves as going astray; and Rome herself had sometimes considered the *paterins*, the *catharins*, the *poor of Lyon*, and all those new religious societies, as so many orders of monks who were rousing the fervour of the public, and who never thought of shaking off her yoke. Innocent III., who ascended the pontifical throne in the vigour of his age, was the first who appeared to feel the importance of that inde-

pendent spirit which was already degenerating into revolt. His predecessors, engaged in a perilous struggle with the two Henrys and Frederic Barbarossa, thought their entire force not too much to defend them against the emperors; and in those times, had themselves accepted the name of *paterins*, which had been given to their most zealous partisans. But Innocent III., whose genius at once embraced and governed the universe, was as incapable of temporizing as he was of pity. At the same time that he destroyed the political balance of Italy and Germany; that he menaced by turns the kings of Spain, of France, and of England; that he affected the tone of a master with the kings of Bohemia, of Hungary, of Bulgaria, of Norway, and of Armenia; in a word, that he directed or repressed at will the Crusaders who were occupied in overturning the Greek empire, and in establishing that of the Latins at Constantinople:—Innocent III., as if he had had no other occupation, watched over, attacked, and punished all opinions different from those of the Roman Church, all independence of mind, every exercise of the faculty of thinking in religion.'

The province of Narbonne is stated to have been in the first instance the object of Innocent's particular attention. In the year 1193, the first of his pontificate, he sent into it two monks of Citeaux, commissioned in the name of the Holy See to discover and pursue heresy, and to invoke against it the vengeance of the civil authorities. To them were afterwards added other commissaries and a number of preaching friars, who traversed the province disputing and inveighing against the new doctrines. The regular clergy, offended by the arrogance and violence of these bold intruders, were not disposed to support them in these measures; and the consequence was, that, under different pretences, the archbishop of Narbonne and the bishops of Toulouse and Viviers were deposed. The bishop of Ozma and his companion St. Dominick, then sub-prior of his cathedral, began about the year 1204 to distinguish themselves by their zeal against the heretics. 'Why do you not drive them out? Why do you not exterminate them?' the former is recorded to have said to the inhabitants of the towns he visited. 'We cannot,' was the reply; 'we have been brought up with them, we have relations among them, and we see the goodness of their lives.' 'Thus,' remarks a contemporary writer, 'does the spirit of falsehood, only by the appearance of a pure and spotless life, lead away these inconsiderate people from the truth.'

The Emperor Otho, the tool and vassal of the Pope, readily granted him an edict for the destruction of the *paterins* in Italy. But there were many of the high lords and barons who had themselves adopted the new opinions, and who, instead of consenting to persecute, protected the heretics; while others

saw in them only industrious vassals, whom they could not destroy without affecting their own revenues and power. No means were left untried by Innocent to overcome this reluctance: on the one hand, he abandoned to them all the property of the heretics, which they chose on any pretence to confiscate; and while he thus stimulated their avarice, he threatened, in case of disobedience, to lay their persons under an anathema, and their dominions under an interdict. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, having refused to comply with the insolent demands of the papal legate, was formally excommunicated; and the subsequent murder of the haughty priest in a quarrel with one of the count's gentlemen, roused to fury the wrath of the papal tyrant. The Count was publicly anathematised, and his territories devoted to destruction. Innocent appealed to the ambition of Philip Augustus, exhorting him to carry on in person the sacred war of extermination against the heretics, who were, he said, far worse than the Saracens, and to strip the Count of Toulouse of all his possessions. He wrote at the same time to the archbishops of Lyons and Tours, to the bishops of Paris and Nevers, and to the Abbot of Citeaux, to engage their concurrence in the diabolical enterprise. Those who should take the Cross against the Provençals, were offered the utmost extent of indulgence that had been granted to those who had laboured for the deliverance of the Holy Land, without incurring the risk and toils of the journey. The first to engage in this domestic crusade, were Eudes, duke of Burgundy, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, (a title which the Count d'Evreux inherited from his English mother,) and the counts of Nevers, St. Paul, Auxerre, Genève, and Forez.

Arnold Amalric, Abbot of Citeaux, at the head of the Bernardine order of monks, emulated the zeal of Peter the Hermit in preaching up this war of extermination; promising, in the name of the Pope and of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, plenary absolution, to the day of their death inclusive, to all who should perish in the expedition. While the Bernardines were thus beating up the drum ecclesiastic for military recruits, Innocent III. charged a new congregation, at the head of which he placed the Spaniard Dominick, to go on foot, two by two, through the villages, to obtain information as to the number, names, and dwellings of all persons suspected of heresy, in order to their being seized and executed when the opportunity should arrive. This was the commencement of the Inquisition. Fouquet, the new bishop of Toulouse, is said to have been the individual who suggested to Innocent the foundation and principal rules of this new order, the experiment of which was made for seven years in his diocese, before

the Pope confirmed it in the council of Lateran. This man, the son of a Genoese merchant settled at Marseilles, had formerly distinguished himself as a troubadour. In his subsequent conduct, marked by all the malignity of a renegade, he afforded one of the few instances in which any persons of that class enlisted on the side of ecclesiastical bigotry. His poetical career terminated in 1200, when he assumed the Cistercian habit and order. His treachery or his zeal appears soon to have recommended him as a fit instrument for carrying into execution the work of papal vengeance; and to him was confided the sequestered bishopric of that diocese which was doomed to be the principal theatre of the tragedy.*

The immense preparations made by these new crusaders, filled Languedoc with terror. It was well known that the countries devoted to vengeance by the monks of Citeaux, as being more particularly the seats of heresy, were the states of Raymond VI. Count of Toulouse, and those of his nephew, Raymond Roger, Viscount of Alby, Beziers, Carcassonne, and Limoux. The former, overwhelmed with terror, declared himself ready to submit to any terms, to avert the invasion of his territories. Innocent received his ambassadors with dissembled favour, holding out the promise of entire pardon; at the same time he secretly directed the Abbot of Citeaux to employ towards this Count a wise dissimulation, that other heretics might be the more easily defeated, and that afterwards he might be crushed when left alone. Raymond Roger, convinced of the inutility of negotiation, placed garrisons in all his strong towns, and prepared for a valiant but unavailing defence.

The divided state of France at this period favoured the infernal project. No national feeling, no common government or common interests united the various principalities. Raymond, Count of Toulouse, applied to his cousin, Philip Augustus, for protection, who received his envoy at first with fair words; but, on discovering that the Count had made a similar application to his rival, the Emperor Otho, he openly refused all assistance, and one body of the crusading army was composed of his subjects, headed by the bishop of Puy. The archbishop of Bourdeaux assembled a second body, composed of levies from Western France, subjects of the King of England; while the main body under Abbot Arnold, assembled at

* A specimen of his poetry is given by the Editor of *Lays of the Minnesingers*, p. 226. He is there stated to have returned to the cloister; but this must be a mistake: he died Bishop of Toulouse.

Lyons, were natives of Burgundy and vassals of the Emperor. Thus, in fact, it seemed as if a partition of the states of Southern France had been agreed upon by the three grand feudal heads. The chief merit and direction of the expedition, however, attached to the Abbot of Citeaux, who, as the personal enemy of the Count of Toulouse, seems to have been actuated by the mixed motives of revenge, fanaticism, and ambition.

In the spring of 1209, the crusading army began to move. The lowest and most probable computation estimates their numbers at 50,000, while some accounts exaggerate the number to three, and even five hundred thousand. We must not, however, include in the former estimate, M. Sismondi says, 'the ignorant and fanatical multitude which followed each preacher, armed with scythes and clubs, promising themselves, that if they were not in a condition to combat the knights of Languedoc, they might at least be able to murder the women and children of the heretics.'

'The nearer the Crusaders approached, the more the Count of Toulouse, who had given himself up to their power, was struck with terror. On the one hand, he endeavoured to gain the affections of his subjects by granting new privileges to some, and pardoning the offences of others: on the other hand, he consented to purchase his absolution from the pope's legate, by the most humiliating concessions. He consigned to the apostolic notary seven of his principal castles as a pledge of his fidelity; he permitted the consuls of his best cities to consent to abandon him if he should depart from the conditions imposed upon him; he submitted beforehand to the judgement which the legate should pronounce upon fifteen accusations which the agents of the persecution had laid against him; and finally, he suffered himself, on the 18th of June, to be conducted into the church of St. Gilles, with a cord about his neck and his shoulders naked, and there received the discipline around the altar. After all these humiliations, he was allowed to take the cross against the heretics; and it was by favour that he was permitted to join those who were about to attack his nephew, becoming their guide for that purpose.'

Pity yields to contempt as we follow this unhappy man through the successive steps of his degradation, although allowance ought to be made for the hold which, in those times, the authority of the church had on the strongest minds. He met the invading army at Valence, and conducted it to Montpellier, where the young Viscount of Beziers made a last effort to conciliate the legate. Arnold replied, that what he had to do, was to defend himself as well as he could, for he should be shewn no mercy. It would have been difficult now, indeed, to turn back the tide of that inundation which had been brought

down upon this fertile and once happy region. It was equally impossible to observe any discrimination between Catholic and heretic.

The monks thirsted for blood, the crusaders, for plunder; and a whole population were their victims. The barons and knights shut themselves up with their peasantry in their castles; but, at the approach of the armed multitude, some were abandoned, as Servian and Puy-la-Roque; others were permitted to ransom themselves. Villemur was burned. At Chasseneuil, after a vigorous resistance, the garrison capitulated, and obtained permission to retire; but the inhabitants, being involved in a sweeping charge of heresy, were massacred, and the place given up to pillage. Beziers, a place of great strength, is said to have been taken by a *coup de main*: the citizens made a *sortie*, but were repulsed and so closely pursued, that the besiegers 'entered the gates with them and found themselves 'masters of the city.' The fact, most probably, was, that they became possessed of it through treachery. It was at the storming of this city, that Abbot Arnold is said to have given the much celebrated reply, when the knights inquired of him, how they should distinguish the Catholics from the heretics: '*Kill them all; the Lord will know his own.*' Historians differ as to the number of victims. The Abbot of Cîteaux, in his letter to Pope Innocent, modestly estimates it at fifteen thousand: Bernard of Limoges, a contemporary, makes it amount to 38,000; and another authority carries it to 60,000. The greater part of the population of the surrounding villages had, in fact, taken refuge within the walls, and the number of women and children must have been considerable.

'When the Crusaders had massacred the last living creature in Beziers, and had pillaged the houses of all that they thought worth carrying off, they set fire to the city in every part at once, and reduced the whole to a vast funeral pile. Not a house remained standing; not one human being alive.'

This massacre took place in the middle of July, 1209. On the 1st of August, not yet satiated with blood, the Crusaders arrived before Carcassonne, where the young Viscount had strongly intrenched himself. The whole country was deserted at their approach, and more than a hundred castles are stated to have been found unoccupied. After a vigorous defence, Raymond Roger was induced by the failure of water in the cisterns and the distress of the inhabitants, to accept of terms of honourable capitulation proposed by the perfidious legate; but no sooner had he presented himself at the camp, than Arnold, disdaining to keep faith with a heretic, ordered him to

be arrested with all the knights included in the capitulation. The city, however, had not yet been given up; and during the night, the greater part of the citizens made their escape by a subterraneous passage said to be three leagues in length, leaving behind all their effects. The besiegers were astonished, the next morning, at finding the walls of the city unoccupied, and for some time they hesitated to enter the deserted city. Arnold, enraged at the escape of his victims, revenged himself on the fugitives collected by his scouts and the prisoners in his hands. Four hundred men and women he caused to be burned, and fifty to be hanged.

The conquered territory was now to be disposed of. Arnold first offered the viscounties of Beziers and Carcassonne to the Duke of Burgundy, but he refused them, saying that he had plenty of domains and lordships of his own, and that he thought they had done the young Viscount evil enough, without despoiling him of his heritage. The Counts of Nevers and St. Paul held similar language. Simon de Montfort, however, had no such scruples, and with affected reluctance he joyfully took possession of the provinces, on which he imposed a heavy tribute. The forty days having expired, which was the term of service agreed on, the Crusaders disbanded and returned home; but De Montfort, turning his arms against the Count de Foix, continued, at the head of his own soldiers, to prosecute the war. In November, the legitimate sovereign of the states he had usurped, and whom he detained a close prisoner, died, as was said, of dysentery: that he perished by a violent death, was believed even by Innocent III.

M. Sismondi attempts to apologize, at the expense of the Church of Rome, for the crimes committed by the Crusaders. They came, he says, 'from that part of Burgundy and Northern France where crimes have always been rare;' but—the heretics were, in their eyes, outcasts from the human race.

'Accustomed to confide their consciences to their priests, to hear the orders of Rome as a voice from heaven, and never to submit to the judgement of reason that which appertained to faith, they congratulated themselves on the horror they felt for the sectaries. The more zealous they were for the glory of God, the more ardently they laboured for the destruction of heretics, the better Christians they thought themselves. And if at any time they felt a movement of pity and terror while assisting at their punishment, they thought it a revolt of the flesh, which they confessed at the tribunal of penitence; nor could they get rid of their remorse till their priests had given them absolution. Wo to the men whose religion is completely perverted! All their most virtuous sentiments lead them astray. Their zeal is changed into ferocity. Their humility consigns them to the

direction of the impostors who conduct them. Their very charity becomes sanguinary : they sacrifice those from whom they fear contagion, and they demand a baptism of blood, to save some elect of the Lord.'

With regard to a large proportion of those who joined the Crusade, however, not even their religion can be admitted as an extenuation of their crimes. They were mere vagabonds and mercenaries. Besides, it may be questioned whether the victims of this most atrocious inroad were regarded with religious horror, so much as with a national antipathy. It was as Provencals, rather than as heretics,—a character which could not be supposed to attach to a whole people, that they were unfeelingly massacred ; just as the natives of a neighbouring island in the days of the Tudors, were hunted and destroyed by the English, not as Catholics, but as Irish. We may admit the full force of M. Sismondi's plea on behalf of the French nation, that Frenchmen were not alone implicated. An Italian, Pope Innocent, first gave the signal, and bestowed the recompense. Two Spaniards, the Bishop of Ozma and the notorious Dominick, rivalled the Abbot of Citeaux in preaching the crusade. Germans, at the call of their monks, came to take part in the work, even from the extremities of Austria. And an Englishman, Matthew Paris, ' bears testimony to the ' zeal of his countrymen in the same cause, and to their triumphant joy at the miracle—for so he calls the massacre of ' Beziers—which had avenged the Lord.'

The conquest of the suspected country had been accomplished, and the war seemed to be terminated ; but the monks of Citeaux, unwilling to lay aside their vocation or to relinquish the profits of their mission, continued to preach the crusade when there were none to combat, impelling, every year, fresh hordes of fanatics upon these miserable provinces. One shudders at the cool ferocity of these emissaries of Satan, who, issuing from their convents, ' spread themselves through the ' states of Europe, occupied all the pulpits, appealed to all the ' passions to convert them into one, and shewed how every vice ' might be expiated by crime, and how the soul polluted with ' every shameful passion, might become pure and spotless by ' bathing in the blood of heretics.'

Simon de Montfort, anxious to secure and not less eager to defend his ill-gotten possessions, readily entered into the views of the Cistercian monks, and at the head of new levies in the following year, he gave full scope to his cruelty. Castle after castle fell into his hands, the inhabitants of which were uniformly massacred. Among those who were induced, in 1211, to take the Cross against the Albigenses, occur the names of

Leopold, duke of Austria, and the Counts of Mons, Juliers, and Auxerre. On the other hand, Count Raymond had at length been stimulated to a vigorous resistance, and now found himself supported by the King of Aragon, the Counts of Foix and Comminges, the Viscount of Bearn, the Seneschal of Aquitaine, and other barons whose interests had become one with his own. Towards the end of the year, he had compelled De Montfort to raise the siege of Toulouse, and had reconquered all the strong places of Albigeois. 'In more than fifty castles, the inhabitants eagerly expelled or massacred their French garrisons, to surrender themselves to their ancient lord.' A short breathing-time was afforded, in 1212, by the crusade against the Moors of Spain, which drew off a considerable number of prelates, barons, knights, and pilgrims from France, Aquitaine, and Italy. Arnold, now archbishop of Narbonne, the archbishop of Bourdeaux, and the bishop of Nantes, were among those who crossed the Pyrenees, to assist in the only achievement by which the Crusaders distinguished themselves in Spain,—the massacre of the Jews at Toledo. Innocent himself, in consequence of the representations of the Court of Aragon, began to waver in his policy, or deemed it prudent to dissemble. The death of the accomplished sovereign of Aragon, who fell before the walls of Muret near Toulouse on the 12th of September, 1213, was an irreparable loss to the Albigenses. But in April following, the Counts of Foix and Comminges, and the city of Toulouse, were permitted to make their peace with the Church, through the medium of a new legate; and in 1215, the fourth council of Lateran put an end to the crusade against the Albigenses, and finally disposed of the conquered territory.

'We have thus traced,' remarks M. Sismondi, 'the total extinction of the first Reformation. The slaughter had been so prodigious, the massacres so universal, the terror so profound and of so long duration, that the Church appeared to have completely attained her object. The worship of the reformed Albigenses had every where ceased. All teaching was become impossible. Almost all the doctors of the new Church had perished in a frightful manner; and the very small number of those who had succeeded in escaping the Crusaders, had sought an asylum in the most distant regions, and were able to avoid new persecutions, only by preserving the most absolute silence respecting their doctrines. The private believers who had not perished by the fire and the sword, or who had not withdrawn by flight, knew that they could save their lives only by burying their secret in their own bosoms. For them, there were no more sermons, no more prayers, no more Christian communion, no more instruction: even their children were not made acquainted with their secret sentiments.'

This was not, however, the termination of the tragedy: and

it was found easier to exterminate the inhabitants of a province, than to extinguish a heresy, which had spread through a great part of France, Italy, Germany, and Spain. In Leon and Galicia, as well as in Aragon, it had made considerable progress; and a complete history of the Albigensic Reformation ought to include a review of the transactions in the Peninsula. M. Sismondi, however, in the present work, is only the historian of France.

It was not long before the two ambitious leaders of the Crusade, who had rivalled each other in deeds of atrocity, De Montfort and Archbishop Arnold, quarrelled about the division of their conquests. Each laid claim to the dukedom of Narbonne. The one had recourse to arms, the other, to the power of excommunication; but the churchman now found himself set at defiance, and appealed in vain to the Pope. Innocent III. died in 1216, while the cause was still pending; but Philip Augustus confirmed De Montfort in all his infamous conquests, acknowledging him as his vassal. He did not long enjoy his possessions. While prosecuting the siege of Toulouse, in June 1218, an enormous stone, projected from the wall of the city, stretched him lifeless on the ground, and delivered the Toulousians from their execrable enemy.

The death of Simon de Montfort marks one of those epochs, M. Sismondi remarks, not unfrequently met with in history, when the historians all forsake us at once. Peter de Vaux Cernay's history of the Albigenses ends with the year 1218. The Chronicle of Guillaume l'Armorique and the anonymous History of Toulouse come down no later than 1219. From 1217 to 1221, what M. Sismondi terms the fifth Crusade, but which was more properly the sixth, the scene of which was laid chiefly in Egypt, occupied the principal attention of the States of Christendom. 'The warlike devotion of the French had resumed its former direction towards the East, and the efforts of Bishop Fouquet to excite new fanatics to the murder of the Albigenses, remained almost without effect.' The young Count Raymond VII. was enabled by this means to establish himself in the government of the provinces of which he had regained possession. But the son of De Montfort was supported by Pope Honorius; and to assist him in maintaining his conquests, that Pope, inheriting the spirit and policy of his predecessor, diverted in his favour one half of the twentieth which had been imposed for the Crusade against the Saracens, upon the clergy of France.

'Prince Louis, son of Philip Augustus, did not yield in fanaticism or in hatred against the heretics, to any of the monks who were his father's subjects. He gladly took upon himself this new expedition

against the Albigenses, to which the twentieth had been destined. The Duke of Brittany, the Count of St. Paul, thirty other French counts, more than twenty bishops, and six hundred knights took the cross to follow him, accompanied by ten thousand archers. With these forces, Louis joined Count Amaury de Montfort before the castle of Marmande, which he was besieging, and which was defended by Count d'Astarrac.'

Pressed by so powerful an army, the besieged were soon induced to capitulate, and Louis pledged his word to their personal safety. But the bishop of Saintes advised him to kill and burn the whole of the inhabitants as heretics and apostates. The Duke of Brittany and the Count of St. Paul are said to have remonstrated against this attempt of the man of God in his holy zeal, to cause the son of the king of France to break his word; and the Archbishop of Auch added that they were *not* heretics. Louis, on this, gave permission to the garrison to proceed where they might think proper; but, in the mean-time,

'Amaury de Montfort had entered into Marmande, and had given command to execute the work which the Bishop of Saintes had recommended, in order to procure the blessing of God upon their arms. All the inhabitants, men, women, and children, to the number of five thousand, were massacred. Louis, after testifying some displeasure against Amaury for having thus violated the royal promise, proceeded with him towards Toulouse, to lay siege to that capital. Bertrand, cardinal priest of St. John and St. Paul, whom Honorius had appointed, in 1217, his legate in Albigeois, had sworn that in Toulouse "should remain neither man, woman, boy, nor girl, but that all should be put to death, without sparing any, old or young, and that, in all the city, there should not remain one stone upon another." This oath had been related to Count Raymond, who, on the approach of the Crusaders, summoned all his friends and allies to his defence.'

For this time, the oath of the Legate was frustrated by the valour of the Toulousians; and, after losing a great number of men by the sword and by sickness, Louis broke up his camp, and retreated with precipitation. Towards the end of 1221, Montauban, Beziers, Agen, and nearly the whole of the province had been regained by Raymond VII., and Carcassonne was almost the only place of strength remaining to Amaury of all his father's conquests. Those of the persecuted party who had escaped by flight, now returned to Languedoc, and numbers poured into this province, fleeing from the severities pursued against them in the neighbouring territories. In vain, attempts were made by the Court of Rome, during the latter years of Philip Augustus, to induce him to engage any further in the destruction of the Albigenses; but at his death, which took place in July, 1223, he bequeathed 20,000 livres to Amau-

ry de Montfort to be employed in the holy work of exterminating heresy. The young Count, however, was finally compelled to abandon the whole of his possessions, to the Counts of Toulouse and Foix; and he transferred all his claims to Louis VIII., receiving as an equivalent the post of Constable of France.

The Court of Rome never lost sight, however, of the object on which it was implacably bent, the destruction of the House of Saint Gilles; and in the spring of 1226, Louis VIII. in virtue of a secret treaty with the Pope, took the field against the heretics, as they were called, at the head of 50,000 horsemen. Intimidated by these formal preparations, as well as overawed by the thunders of the Church, all the allies of Raymond preserved, or affected to preserve, a strict neutrality, with the single exception of the Count de Foix, who knew that it would be in vain for him to temporize. Excessive fear dissolved all the ancient bonds of affection, of relationship, and of feudal subjection; and when Louis arrived at Lyons, on the 28th of May, he received deputation after deputation from the barons and cities in the county, tendering respectively their submission and allegiance. Avignon, Arles, Marseilles, and Nice, and all the country situated on the left bank of the Rhone, belonged at that time to the empire, not to France. The authority of the Emperor over that part of the country was, however, reduced to a mere name; and when Avignon, though attached to the House of St. Gilles, offered to Louis provisions and the passage of the Rhone, the Legate and the priests instigated him to demand a free passage through the city. Upon this, the consuls boldly shut their gates against him. After some ineffectual negotiation, on the 10th of June, Louis commenced the siege of this city; but to reduce it, was found a more difficult enterprise than the Legate and the Crusaders had anticipated. During the three months that the siege was maintained, the Count of St. Paul, the Bishop of Limoges, and two hundred knights banneret, sunk under the destructive fever that attacked the army; and Matthew Paris makes the total number of all ranks who perished before the walls, amount to 20,000 men. At length, on the 12th of September, the city capitulated on honourable terms, but which, regard for the Emperor alone induced the King and the Legate to concede or to observe. Fifteen days after Louis had taken the city, a terrible inundation of the Durance covered the space which had been occupied by the French camp, so that, had not the soldiers taken up their quarters within the walls, they would all have been swept away. Louis now advanced without opposition to within four leagues of Toulouse, receiving, in his way, the homage of the nobles, and magnificently feasted by Bishop Fouquet.

' But the germs of that malady which had caused so many ravages during the siege of Avignon, still remained in the army; and the fatigue, the heat, and the march across an unhealthy country during the feverish season, gave them additional activity. The Archbishop of Rheims, the Count of Namur, and Bouchard de Marli, were among the first victims of this epidemic. On his arrival at Montpensier in Auvergne, on the 29th of October, Louis VIII. felt himself attacked: he was obliged to rest there, and soon discovered that his malady was mortal. He expired on the 8th of November, 1226.'

The death of this monarch put an end to the Crusade, though not to the disorders and calamities with which this unhappy province continued to be ravaged for the ensuing seventeen years. The history of these events, however, is but remotely connected with the crusade against the Albigenses, nor is it narrated in a very clear or succinct manner. In 1229, Raymond VII. abandoned to Louis IX. two thirds of his hereditary possessions, and consented to hold the remainder as a fief of the Crown, submitting at the same time to the most humiliating conditions with a view to make his peace with his insatiable persecutors. In the same year, the Inquisition was permanently established in Languedoc; the walls of Toulouse were thrown down, to punish the citizens for their resistance; and here the infernal Fouquet spent the last years of his life in acts of tyranny and ferocious zeal. He died in 1231.

' The reform which had commenced in Albigeois, had been extinguished there by the arms of half Europe. Blood never ceased to flow, nor the flames to devour their victims in these provinces, now abandoned to the dark fanaticism of the inquisitors. But that terror which had dispersed the heretics, had also scattered sparks through all Europe, by which the torch of reason might be again rekindled. No voice, no outward appearance announced the preaching of reform, or troubled the public tranquillity. Yet, the proscribed Albigenses, who, far from their country, had found an asylum in the cottage of the peasant, or the poor artisan, whose labours they shared in profound obscurity, had taught their hosts to read the gospel in common, to pray in their native tongue without the ministry of priests, to praise God, and gratefully submit to the chastisements which his hand inflicted, as the means of their sanctification. In vain did the Inquisition believe that it had compelled human reason to submission, and established an invariable rule of faith. In the midst of the darkness which it had created, it saw, all at once, some luminous points appear, where it would least have expected them. Its efforts to extinguish, served only to scatter them; and no sooner had it conquered, than it was compelled to renew the combat.' p. 235.

A considerable number of heretics were discovered in Rome itself, whom Gregory IX. caused to be burned before the gates of Santa Maria Majora, while others, who were priests or

clerks, were imprisoned. The report of their appearance in Lombardy and the two Sicilies, induced the Pope to profit by his recent reconciliation with Frederic II., to obtain a sanguinary edict against them. The knights of St. Jago of Galicia were, by a bull, specially charged with the extermination of heresy in the Peninsula. Others of the Albigenses are stated to have found refuge in Gascony, then a dependency of the English crown, but where the authority of the government was almost absolutely disregarded; so that here, 'the heretics, masters of the strong castles, defended themselves by open force.' At Stettin in Germany, the heresy which had been supposed to be extirpated, re-appeared to the great dismay of the Court of Rome.

'Gregory addressed bulls to the bishops of Minden, of Lubeck, and of Rachhasbourg in Styria, to induce them to preach up a crusade against the heretics. In order to excite greater horror against these sectaries, the most fearful things were related concerning them, which excited equal astonishment and abomination. A hideous toad, said the Pope, was presented at once to the adoration and the caresses of the initiated. The same being, who was no other than the devil, afterwards took, successively, different forms, all equally revolting, and all offered to the salutations of his worshippers. Such an accusation could not fail of success. The fanatics took up arms in crowds, under the conduct of the German bishops. The Duke of Brabant and the Count of Holland joined them, and took the command of this army of the Cross. Those among the sectaries who were not in a condition to carry arms, or who had not taken refuge in the strong places, were first brought to judgement; and in the year 1233, "an innumerable multitude of heretics were burned alive, through all Germany: a still greater number were converted." The army of the crusaders afterwards marched against Stettin: the sectaries had the boldness to arrest them in the open field; but six thousand of them were destroyed in the combat: others were driven into the Oder, and drowned, and the whole race was exterminated.'

* * * * *

'The reader is, doubtless, wearied with the repetition of the same decrees, the same menaces, and the same horrors; but, if we did not follow the persecutors in the annual renewal of their laws and of their sanguinary acts, we should give a very false idea of the progress of power, and of the sufferings of the people. Heresy was not destroyed by those violent shocks, after which we may at least be permitted to enjoy the peace and silence of the tomb. These disastrous revolutions were succeeded by a protracted agony, but tranquillity was never restored: persecution was never suspended, even by the death of its victims. The only expedient for maintaining the unity of the faith which the Church had ever known, was to burn those who separated from it. For two hundred years the fires had been kindled; yet, every day, Catholics abandoned the faith of their

fathers, to embrace that which must conduct them to the flames. It was in vain that Gregory IX. had destroyed, in 1231, all the heretics who had been concealed at Rome and in the states of the Church. Numerous letters addressed by him, in 1235, to all the bishops of that part of Italy, announced, that, notwithstanding the severity of the Inquisitors, the *paterins* had made fresh progress. A council was also held the same year in France, at Narbonne, at which the archbishops of Narbonne, of Arles, and of Aix presided, which addressed a circular to the inquisitors of the three provinces, declaring, likewise, that heresy had broken out afresh.' pp. 245, 6.

Yet, owing to circumstances which are not very clearly ascertained, the Protean policy of the Court of Rome led to the issuing of an order, only two years after (1237), addressed to the inquisitors of Languedoc, directing them to suspend all inquiries respecting heretics; and, in fact, throughout this province, from the year 1237 to 1241, the Inquisition remained in a state of total inactivity. The shameless exactions and unprincipled proceedings of the Inquisitors, and the spirited remonstrance of the republican cities of the South of France, are supposed to have produced this order. The Inquisition, however, was either not totally suppressed, or had been re-established, when, on the 28th of May, 1242, some 'heretics' surprised the castle of Avignonet, and captured the whole tribunal, consisting of four Dominicans, two Franciscans, and seven familiars of the Holy Office, whom they cut to pieces. The wretched men are said to have awaited their fate on their knees, and singing *Te Deum*, confident of insuring the crown of martyrdom by the punishment of their crimes.

The connexion between the Waldenses of Piedmont and the Albigenses of France, will come under consideration in a future article. In the mean time, we cannot forbear remarking, that neither M. Sismondi nor his Translator has duly or competently dealt with the question, how far the crusade against the Albigenses partook of a religious, and how far of a political character. That the extermination of heresy was the pretended object of the crusade, must be admitted; and so it was of that crusade in which the Latin barbarians turned their arms against the Greek Christians, instead of the Saracens, and pillaged the capital of the Eastern empire. But that this was a mere pretext, is evident; since the majority of the inhabitants of Languedoc could not be supposed to have embraced the new doctrines; and there must have been other reasons why the territories of the Count of Toulouse were fixed upon as the theatre of this desolating warfare. The Court of Rome has sometimes had the credit of originating measures

which have been concerted in other cabinets; and not unfrequently, the Pope, like other sovereigns, has been the dupe of misrepresentation and intrigue, and a tool in the hands of a crafty secretary, legate, or foreign ambassador. It is, we think, quite clear, that the destruction of the house of St. Gilles had been resolved upon by the monks of Citeaux. By their arts and efforts the crusade was both brought about and directed, and they wielded in this war the whole power of Rome. The secret springs of these transactions may perhaps be sought for in the private motives of revenge and ambition by which Arnold and Fouquet were actuated. But for some powerful influence of this kind, it would be wholly unaccountable, that the Count de Foix, who was notoriously inclined to favour the Albigensic heretics, should have found little difficulty in reconciling himself with the Court of Rome; while the devoted Count of Toulouse, whose orthodoxy there was no ground to impeach, was unable, by the most humiliating concessions, to purchase leave to hold his possessions in quiet. The unrelenting manner in which he was pursued, did not comport with the usual policy of the Vatican, and Innocent III. appears to have been disposed to protect him. Many fathers, who assisted at the Lateran Council, strenuously defended the persecuted counts, and deprecated in strong terms the atrocities committed in the province, which they charged on Bishop Fouquet as their principal author. That the chief conspirator should have been at one time a troubadour, is a very remarkable circumstance; and we may be assured that it was not any religious motive that led him to take shelter among the monks of Citeaux. As to the Abbot, Count Raymond distinctly complained to the Pope, that a man should be sent as legate into his territory, who was his personal enemy.

In the subsequent struggle between the houses of St. Gilles and Montfort, religion had no concern. The history of those times abounds with similar feuds and contests, where both parties were alike true sons of the Church. Nor must it be forgotten, that the horrors of the Albigensic crusade were the common attendants upon civil warfare. The history of the Norman conquest, the pages of Froissart, the annals of the Italian Republics, and the history of Ireland, exhibit but too many counterparts to the transactions which we have been reviewing. The history of Eccelino III. lord of Romano, is a remarkable instance. So great was the general abhorrence at length excited by his excesses, that, in the year 1256, a crusade was declared against him under the auspices of Pope Alexander IV., and a prelate, the Archbishop of Ravenna, was at the

head of it.* A holy war seems to have been, indeed, a natural and convenient expedient; and though the parties against whom the crusade was undertaken, would no doubt be held up as enemies of the Church, there is little propriety in confounding such wars with direct acts of religious persecution.

Among the thousands who were the victims of this crusade, many claim to be distinguished as martyrs. But the sufferings of the Provençals as a nation, do not belong to martyrology, any more than those which attended the Norman invasion of England, or which have been consequent on the struggle between the Constitutionals and the Monkish party in the Spanish Peninsula. The truth is, that the national antipathies and political animosities of those times, took their colour and character from the prevailing superstition, and thus, fanaticism blended itself with every civil revolution and every military enterprise. The share which religion had in such transactions, has probably been exaggerated by writers of either party;—by the Romish historians, with a view to magnify the triumphs of their Church, and to justify such unprovoked aggressions on the part of the prelates,—by Protestant writers, to excite a just indignation against the Romish tyranny. But, on a closer examination, they will appear to have been of a very mixed character, while mixed motives actuated the leading parties. To Popery as a system, and to the policy of the Court of Rome, must, indeed, be ascribed the guilt of having inflamed and dreadfully aggravated the disorders of that critical period. Yet, it would be a very narrow view of the subject that would lead us to see nothing in the history of those events, but a struggle between the Church and the heretics. This was but as it were an under-plot of the political drama. Pope and prelate were but other names for emperor and prince; bishops were seen fighting at the head of invading armies, and the heads of religious orders were, in fact, territorial sovereigns, the equals and rivals of the feudal nobility. The contest was between arbitrary power and the nascent spirit of civil liberty, of which the religious reformation was in great measure the effect, as it was discerned to be the symptom. The sacerdotal power had been established on the ruins of popular freedom; and the rising wealth and importance of the municipalities of Southern France,—the republican spirit, cherished by commercial enterprise and equitable institutions, which began to manifest itself, and which betrayed itself sometimes with great boldness in the songs of the Troubadour,—the new attitude, in fact, assumed by the people, more especially in the cities of the South,

* See Eccl. Rev. Vol. XIX. p. 10.

perplexed both priests and potentates with fears of disastrous change. Religious bigotry had very little share in awakening those animosities which sprang from the fears of a coward despotism. The love of liberty was the great heresy which it was sought to exterminate, and literature was regarded with almost equal hostility, from its well known connexion with a spirit of freedom. Thus, the Provençal language itself seems to have been treated as a traitor; and all the efforts of the joint conspiracy between the throne and the altar had for their object, to barbarize in order to enslave.

The same interests and the same principles are still at work, as the antagonists of popular freedom. They have developed themselves in all their native horrors in Spain. They preside equally over the councils of Austria, and we fear of Russia, and are struggling for ascendancy in France. Why give the name of Popery to this spirit of despotism, when all history proves that it can ally itself to any church, or to any form of government, that is invested with arbitrary power? The priest and the tyrant are natural allies; they have often been united in the same individual; and so have the patriot and the reformer. Still, they are distinct characters. Protestantism has furnished its Popes; Romanism has had its patriots and its martyrs. It is the alliance of despotism with a fanatical bigotry, that produces the monster Persecution. But the distinctive and specific character of Popery or Romanism, is that of a *spiritual* usurpation; a system adapted at once to cripple and to debase all the powers of the intellect and the best energies of the heart. There may be such a thing as a selfish and unmanly dread of Popery, founded on traditional alarms, in those who are themselves the fautors of arbitrary power, and the enemies of those popular rights which are the best security of our Protestant freedom. At all events, it becomes the Christian to regard Popery chiefly in the light of a spiritual evil, an awful perversion of the faith of Christ, and a deadly snare to the souls of men; and as such, it must be combated. Parliamentary enactments will not cast it out: this kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and the Word of God.

Art. III. *The Friend of India*. Quarterly Series. No. XII. May, 1825. Serampore. Printed at the Mission Press.

WE have had occasion to refer, in some former Numbers, to this well conducted and highly valuable periodical miscellany issuing from the Serampore Press. The present Number contains several interesting articles to which we may

hereafter find an opportunity to advert; in particular, some Remarks on the Manners and Character of the Burmese, communicated by the Rev. G. H. Hough*, and articles on the progress of religious and charitable institutions, and of the Native Press in India. But our present object is to put our readers in possession of the substance of a paper containing an account of a journey undertaken in 1824, at the desire of the much lamented Sir Stamford Raffles, for the purpose of exploring a part of the unknown interior of the Island of Sumatra. That important island has since been given up to the Dutch, in exchange for their possessions in the Peninsula. The narrative, however, will not on that account be deemed the less interesting.

The nation to whom this mission was directed, inhabit the populous districts in the interior of the Bay of Tappanooly. The general opinion of the ferocity of the Batak character, together with the representations of various individuals residing in the Bay, had led to its being considered as a somewhat hazardous enterprise to explore their country.

‘Unfortunately, the well-attested practice of Cannibalism in some of its most odious forms, so horrible to the imagination of civilized nations, had served to corroborate their worst representations; and a barrier had thus been raised against almost every effort of research into a populous country, for more than a century bordered by our settlements and factories, and the exclusive source of some of our most valuable articles of commerce. Except a journey performed upwards of fifty years ago by Messrs. Millar and Holloway, which appears to have been extended scarcely beyond the woody hills on the west, we are not aware of any personal communications which Europeans have had with what may properly be called the Batak country, or the open and more level districts between the mountains and the straits of Malacca.’

The expedition party consisted of Messrs. Burton and Ward, their two servants, and sixteen koolies. On the 30th of April, they left the village of Sibolga, and crossed the bay to the mouth of the river of Tappanooly. Here they landed, and proceeded for two hours over a grassy valley, enlivened with cultivated spots, and intersected by mountain torrents, which, at the distance of two miles from the Bay, form the river above mentioned. At one o'clock, they began to ascend the first range of mountains, and at about half past five, reached a village on the other side, named Parik Debata, commanding an

* Of these, the Editor of the *Modern Traveller* has availed himself in his volume on Birmah, Siam, and Anam, p. 75, &c.

extensive view of a hilly district lying between prolongations of the first and second great ranges of mountains. The road thus far was extremely rugged and difficult, lying over an assemblage of hills 'so irregularly clustered as to afford but a faint resemblance of the distinct ranges of the southern parts of the island.' In one place, it descended for half an hour in an almost perpendicular water-course, where the points and edges of the bare rock occasioned much annoyance. At the foot of the hill of Parik Debata, they discharged their fire-arms; 'a useful practice of the Bataks, to signify the peaceable approach of travellers and persons of distinction.' The salute was returned by the chief and several of the people, who met the party in a friendly manner, and escorted them to the village, where they were treated with grilled veal, hospitably lodged, and dismissed in the morning with every mark of respect; the chief conducting them the next stage of their journey.

The second evening, they reached a village near the middle of the hilly plain,—as it must be called in reference to the loftier mountains. The district is called Pagaran Lambung, and contains ten or twelve villages, each averaging from 250 to 300 souls. The surface of this tract consists almost entirely of hills of various dimensions, covered with wood, except in the vicinity of the villages, where they have been partially cleared for the cultivation of the sweet potatoe. Every hill of the vast number appeared to give rise to a stream or two of water: these, winding along their bases, are collected, near the middle of the two ranges, into a considerable river, which, passing rapidly over a bed of rocks in a northerly direction, falls into the sea about twelve miles to the north of Tappanooly. Camphor, gambir, and benzoin-trees were observed to abound in great perfection, with a variety of singular plants. The country seemed very free from wild beasts: they met with but a single track of one, which was said to be that of a rhinoceros.

The third day, being Sunday, the party halted at a neighbouring village. On the fourth, they resumed their journey, and in four hours, passed Huta Tinggi, a village situated on an elevated part of the second range. The route then lay for some distance over woody hills and deep valleys as before, till, at length, they entered upon a more open country, where the hills sank to mere undulations, and after a rapid march of five hours, reached a dirty hamlet at the foot of a lofty mountain. Here they halted for the night. In the morning, they were conducted to the opposite side of the mountain, where an opening in the hills afforded a delightful view of the Toba

districts at an immense distance. The mountain itself had been cleared on every side for cultivation, retaining its original forest merely in a tuft at the top. On descending its verdant side, they entered a richly cultivated valley, in which, although few habitations were as yet discernible, every thing indicated their approach to an extensive population. The scenery here was eminently beautiful.

‘ The valley may be described as three miles in length, and the fourth of a mile in breadth, winding so variously among the hills as to present almost at every step a new and distinct prospect. A mountain stream, meandering from side to side throughout its extent, and terminating in a fine cascade, contributes equally to its beauty and fertility. Its surface, perfectly flat and even, presented a continued chain of rice-fields almost ready for the sickle. The soil became sandy and grey. The hills were entirely free from wood, and planted with the sweet potatoe, in many instances to the very top. The beauty and variety of the scene, contrasted with the rugged wilds to which we had been accustomed, produced on our minds an effect so delightful, that, had our journey terminated here, we should have felt quite repaid for the labour it had cost us.

‘ The path at length ascended into a clift of the hills, from which our attention was drawn by a fall of the rivulet. On turning aside to view it, a portion of the district of Silindung discovered itself through a break of the trees. Nothing can express the astonishment with which we were seized when we reached the brow of the hill, and obtained a more extensive view. Even the coolies, at this unexpected scene, appeared for a moment transfixed to the spot, and with one accord cast down their burdens, and burst into expressions of the warmest admiration. The principal object of the picture was an even plain ten or twelve miles in length, forming a vast unbroken field of rice. A fine broad river, with numberless tributary streams winding through it from end to end, and supplying aqueducts for irrigation in every direction, served to adorn it. But the numbers of villages bestudding its borders, and scattered over its surface, and the concourse of people assembled at a market in its centre, together with the variety of objects inseparable from the busy haunts of man, rendered it interesting beyond expression. The plain is surrounded by hills from 500 to 1000 feet high, in a state of cultivation; and the whole surrounding country was perfectly free from wood, except the summits of two or three mountains, said to be the abode of monstrous serpents and evil spirits.’

On preparing to descend into the plain, they did not omit to discharge the customary salute to announce their approach, when they were soon joined by several chiefs of villages who were returning from a trading journey to Tappanooly. The news of the arrival of white men where such a sight had never been witnessed, quickly spread through the market they were approaching, and an immense concourse was drawn forth to

meet them. The conduct of the multitude strongly reminded them of the effect produced by the first appearance of the Spaniards in Mexico, 'not only with regard to surprise and curiosity, but as it respects that simplicity and imbecillity which seem so strikingly to have marked the American character.' Finding it impossible to make way for them through the eager crowd, their guide conducted them by a circuitous path to the market-place, where they found the chiefs and elders seated in a circle with immense brass pipes, awaiting their arrival. Here, the noise and pressure became more violent than ever, and they were compelled to take shelter in a house, several of the chiefs clearing the way before them with their formidable pipes. Nothing, however, would satisfy the childish clamours of the multitude, but their exhibiting themselves, and every article about them, from a loft which overlooked the street.

The Travellers represent themselves as having been scarcely less interested with the internal appearance of this village, than they had previously been with that of the surrounding country. It consisted of twenty-four houses, ranged in a straight line, with the gable ends towards the street, and separated from each other by an open space of three or four yards.

'The opposite side was formed by a corresponding row of open buildings on the same model, somewhat smaller, appropriated by night as the sleeping-place of the young men, and, by day, to the more public occupations of the family; the space between the cieling and the roof being used as a granary and a depot for the skulls of their enemies. Each house was elevated five or six feet above the ground on large wooden posts or pillars. The side walls, of planks, were carried about four feet from the floor, projecting outward from the bottom to the top. The ends were formed by a similar projection continued to the apex roof, and forming a kind of inclined gable. The roof appeared disproportionately large, being very high, sunk in the middle, raised and projected at the ends, and surmounted, at each apex, with an imitation of a bullock's head and horns; thus affording a convenient shade in the street from the rain and the sun. The entrance, unlike that of the Batak houses on the coast, was by a trap-door in the floor from beneath. The interior contained no separate apartments, but formed a single room thirty or forty feet by twenty. In each of the four corners was a fire-place; but, there being neither windows nor vent for the smoke, to remain long within was felt as almost intolerable. A large shelf or loft, erected down the middle and along the sides, together with a wooden jar or two, or a chest scooped out of the trunk of a tree, and a few dishes and cooking utensils, constituted the principal articles of furniture. Of the detail and economy of the interior, however, we can give but a faint idea. Something may be conjectured from the fact, that each house was peopled with no fewer than from thirty to forty inmates. The

houses were constructed generally of excellent materials, exhibiting marks of superior workmanship, and in many instances ornamented with carving and paint. The villages being clean, and the females occupied in the manufacture of cloth, and surrounded with numbers of playful children, they afforded a pleasing idea of industry, health, and domesticity.*

Indisposition prevented the Travellers from prosecuting their journey, as they had intended, as far as the great Lake of Toba, situated about 30 miles to the north-east. From the information which they were able to collect from the coincident reports of several natives, it would appear to be 60 or 70 miles in length, and from 15 to 20 miles in breadth. Near the centre is an island a mile perhaps in diameter, on which is held an extensive periodical market, a variety of commodities being carried thither from the surrounding shores in long canoes, worked by from forty to sixty paddles. A deep and rapid river was represented as emptying itself into the lake at its northern end, besides numerous smaller streams from every quarter. The natives were ignorant of any outlet, but concurred in stating, that the waters rise and fall, twice a day, from a cubit to two feet, and that this rise and fall are greater at the full and change of the moon. Being wholly unacquainted with the ebbing and flowing of the tide, they attributed this motion of the lake to the power of evil spirits. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this lake communicates at its south-eastern extremity with an arm of the sea, which these gentlemen think to be in all probability the river Rakkan of the charts*. The range of lofty mountains which was observed stretching down from the northern extremity along the eastern side of the lake, terminates abruptly at about half its length, leaving the country low and open. The ignorance of the Bataks of Silindung respecting this outlet, was subsequently accounted for by a chief of Tappanooly, who said, that there was a certain point towards the south-east, which was regarded by them as the abode of evil spirits, and beyond which any attempt to pass would be punished with immediate destruction.

The country between Silindung and Toba consists of an elevated plain, about thirty miles by twenty in extent, for the most part cleared of wood, and under cultivation. It is called the district of Butur. The Batak country is described generally

* Called *Rakau* in Hamilton's Gazetteer. It is there stated to be navigable for sloops to a great distance from the coast; 'but vessels are deterred from entering it by the rapidity of the current, or more probably the reflux of the sea.' This latter conjecture seems to be all but verified.

as comprising the whole of that part of Sumatra which lies between the line and $2^{\circ} 30'$ N. lat., with the exception of a few Malay settlements at the mouths of the rivers on either coast. On the N. W. it is bounded by Acheen, and on the S. E. by the Malay countries of Rawa and Manangkabaw. The Lake of Toba is situated near the centre of the Batak country, and the most populous districts are on its borders. Of the people themselves, hitherto so completely removed from the observation of Europeans, we have the following account, partly derived from the information gathered on the journey, and partly the result of previous acquaintance.

In their personal appearance, the Bataks of Silindung bear a considerable resemblance to the Hindoos. They are generally of a middle stature, well made and robust; their features distinct, and the nose rather prominent; their skins smooth and of lighter complexion than those of the natives of the coast. The men wear the hair long and tied at the top of the head, in the manner of the Hindoos; while the women part the hair in front, precisely like the women of India, without any head-dress. The countenances of the children unite mildness with great vivacity, but, on attaining the age of ten or twelve, they are disfigured by the monstrous custom of filing down the teeth nearly to the gum, and blackening the stump. All trace of beauty is moreover obliterated in the females soon after reaching maturity, owing to their being employed in most of the labours of the field, as well as in the manufactory of cloth and in all sorts of domestic drudgery. Both sexes are exceedingly addicted to smoking a stimulating herb of a slightly narcotic quality, which, however, they eagerly abandon for tobacco. The men, whether on a journey or at home, having little employment, are seldom seen without their pipes, the tubes of which are generally about four feet in length, with a bowl of proportionate size, giving the idea of a sledge hammer. Those used by the chiefs are mostly of brass, polished and neatly indented: those of the common people are of wood, and not so large.

In quietness and timidity, the people of Silindung are not surpassed even by the Hindoos. Misunderstandings between individuals of the same village, seldom go beyond words or a complaint to the chief; and their wars, if such they can be called, exist for five or six years without any hostile depredation or loss of many lives on either side. This peaceable disposition, the Writer seems disposed to resolve into 'cowardice' and the influence of a dark and enslaving superstition;—although it is not very obvious, how so good a result can arise

from so foul a source. Cowardice is generally associated with cruelty, and superstition seldom puts on this pacific character.

With regard to their religious notions, they are stated to believe in one Supreme Being, Creator of the world, whom they name *Debata-Hasi-asi*; but this deity, like the Bramha of the Hindoos, is supposed to have remained perfectly quiescent ever since completing the work of creation, having wholly committed the government of the world to his three sons, *Batara-guru*, the god of justice, *Sori-pada*, the god of mercy, and *Mangana-bulan*, the origin of evil and the most powerful of the three. The first of these seems to answer in some respects to the Hindoo *Vrihusputee* or Jupiter. *Guru* or *Gooroo* is the Hindoo word for teacher, and *Batara* is only *Avatara* accommodated to the Malay pronunciation. *Vrihusputee* was priest and preceptor to the gods, 'the lord of words,' and may perhaps be considered as an avatar or form of Bramha. *Sori-pada* corresponds in his mild character to Vishnoo; while *Mangana-bulan* is still more evidently Shivu, the destroyer. These three deities are supposed, however, not to govern in person, but through the medium of certain vakeels or ministers, who are stationed over distinct departments; a species of genii, who are divided into *debata digingang*, *debata-ditoru*, and *debata dos-tonga*,—divi or demons above, below, and of the middle. Besides these, every village is supposed to have its particular guardian deities, and every individual his attendant ghosts and demons, good and evil, called *bogus* and *saitans*. On their way to Tappanooly, the Travellers were asked, whether they had seen any *saitans* on the road. No idols are worshipped, and in fact, no offerings of gratitude or adoration are paid; but, in every village, is found a stone or wooden image before whom all oaths are taken, and who is appealed to on solemn occasions in the presence of the whole village. A translation is given of the form of adjuration. The first part is not very intelligible; the second consists of an appeal to *Debata Hasi-asi* and his three sons; it then proceeds:—

'Hei ancestors! Sons of Si-pa-sa-ri-bu, the fathers of our country, who first cleared our forests, and taught us to build houses! who possessed our coasts and our harbours, who gave us laws and letters, weights and measures, and this image before which we swear! Hear, see, observe now intently, our present transaction.

'Hei, all ye gods of the world, from the east, north-east, north, north-west, west, south-west, south, south-east, of whom we know not the elder or the younger, but great is your number. Assemble now before and behind, on the right and on the left of this image. Hear, see, intently observe our doings! If he swear falsely, sink

him into the earth, not to be raised again, or snatch him on high, never to be seen again, or burst him asunder, not to be again bound up. Let him and all his property be utterly lost by day and by night for ever and ever.'

This religious veneration for their ancestors and belief in supernatural agency, will appear to be in no wise connected with any clear ideas of moral rectitude. Of a future state of recompense and punishment, they have no conception. Almost every village has its *datu* or priest, who is sometimes the *raja* or chief; but his whole functions consist in divination and conjuring. They bury their dead, at least their chiefs, in coffins of wood or stone, celebrating the funeral by feasts. They have written laws, which are not in general very severe; the penalties, with few exceptions, being fines. But those exceptions are the more remarkable from the very unusual disposal of the body which is substituted among the Bataks for anatomical dissection.

'Persons caught in the very act of house-breaking or high-way robbery, are publicly executed with the knife or match-lock, and are then immediately eaten. But, if the delinquents are fortunate enough to escape immediate seizure, they are only fined. A man taken in adultery is instantly commenced upon, and may be lawfully eaten piece-meal without first depriving him of life. Men killed, or prisoners taken in a great war, are also publicly eaten; but, if only two villages be engaged, this is not allowable. The dead are then left on the field, to be buried by their respective parties, and prisoners may be redeemed. Twelve months ago, twenty persons were completely eaten in one day at the village where we resided in Silindung, the skulls of whom are still preserved. They were inhabitants of a village situated near the path leading to the coast, whom our host represented as having so often plundered the passengers, that their conduct became at length insufferable. These were the last who had thus suffered in Silindung.'

Of all the accounts of anthropophagous practices which we have ever seen, this is, perhaps, the most capricious and extraordinary. One might almost imagine that the assigned punishment of the felon must originally have been, his being thrown to wild beasts, and that, for want of such executioners at hand, —or from grudging the beasts of prey their gratification and their food,—this refinement upon the punishment had been introduced, by which their part is performed by the human animals. In this case, it would seem to be neither scarcity of food, nor a vitiated taste, nor private revenge, nor superstition, nor a sense of military honour, that has led to the practice,—but, strange to say, a homage to public justice and indignation against the criminal! It must, however, be observed, that the

Bataks are very gross feeders. It is only on particular occasions, indeed, we are told, that they indulge themselves in eating animal food, but, in their choice of animals or even reptiles, they are by no means delicate.

‘Horses, buffaloes, cows, pigs, goats, and fowls, are esteemed the best; but they do not scruple to eat dogs, cats, snakes, *monkeys*, bats, &c. Nor does it make any particular difference in their estimation, whether the animal or reptile has died a natural death, or whether it was killed in good health; whether it be recently dead, or whether bordering on putridity. When an animal is killed for food, they reserve the blood, and use it as sauce, pouring it over the meat when cooked and chopped into pieces of about an ounce each.’

In point of fact, then, though, in this instance, we cannot trace the origin of cannibalism to the prevalence of the practice of destroying and feeding upon anthromorphous animals,—it is found connected with the same grossness of appetite and omnivorous propensities that are remarked in the American tribes. The above statement strikingly confirms another observation to which we had occasion to advert in connexion with this subject in our last Number*; namely, that the tribes who are addicted to anthropophagy, are not always the rudest or the most ferocious. Cannibalism, in the Bataks, seems united with a considerable degree of civilization; and though they cannot, these Travellers say, be considered as kind and humane, numerous instances occurring of their extreme unfeelingness and cruelty, still, they are pacific, mild, and even hospitable. They afford the only instance, moreover, at least in modern times, of a tribe addicted to anthropophagy, who were in possession of written laws and a species of literature. It would be satisfactory to ascertain whether the practice be of long standing,—a remnant of a more barbarous stage of society, which has been modified by the existing restrictions,—or one of modern introduction.

The language of the Bataks bears so close a resemblance to that of the Malays, as to leave on the minds of the Travellers no doubt of their common origin. Of the most common substantives, one word in three is either the same as in the Malay, or so similar as to be immediately recognized by the scholar. The modifications of the verb also are in conformity to those which take place in the Malay. The proportion of Sungskrit in the Batak language is, however, believed to be greater, owing, perhaps, to its having received no accessions from the Arabic. Their language of common conversation (*hata tohop*) differs more widely from the Malay, than the written language

* P. 306.

(*hata ha-ba-i-tan*). Their alphabetic character is of Sangskrit origin, and is written from left to right*. It is calculated that not more than one in fifty can read. Dr. Marsden, who intimates that one half can read, is supposed to have been misinformed. They have books on war, religion, and medicine, and are said even to have a history of the creation and an account of the origin of their country; but 'copies of these,' it is added, 'we have not met with.' Their poetical compositions, in structure and in every other quality, closely resemble those of the Malays: the quatrain stanza is uniformly observed, and they are represented to be very apt in introducing these rhyming *pantuns* in common conversation. Three specimens are given, with a 'rather free translation.' The first half of the stanza seems, in these instances, to have no other connexion with the sentiment in the second half, than its supplying the rhyme; as in the well known Nursery couplet,

'Dickery, dickery, dock:
The Cat ran up the clock, &c.'

We give one of the specimens:

'Urat ni Sa-pi-lu-lut
Sa-ur hon Si-ba-gu-ri.
U-nang hita na-gu-lut
Ra-ha-nan pa-u-li-ta-i.'

'The roots of the sapilulut
Mingle with those of the sibaguri.
Never wrangle about a matter;
It is better to discuss it calmly.'

In answer to various questions on the origin of the Bataks, the principal chief of Silindung informed his visitors, that they considered themselves as the first people who had settled in Sumatra; that all traditions respecting the mother country were lost, except that it was situated far to the east beyond the sea; that they first landed to the eastward of the lake, and having discovered the conveniences it afforded, they settled on its borders; that, having greatly multiplied in the course of time, numbers came and settled in the plain of Silindung; that, by a further increase of population, the districts of Dairi to the north, and of Angkola to the south, were successively occupied; and that the inhabitants of the latter gradually extended themselves to Manangkabaw, which eventually acquired more

* 'Not in perpendicular columns, as some have supposed.' In Hamilton's Gazetteer, they are represented as writing from the bottom to the top.

consequence than the rest. The Sultan of Manangkabaw is, in fact, still regarded as the head of the nation and the sovereign of the country ; besides whom, there appears to be a sort of ecclesiastical supremacy vested in a chief who resides on the north-western extremity of the great Lake ; but his authority is stated to be merely nominal.

Upon the whole, there seems sufficient reason to conclude that the Bataks are a branch of the same stock as the Malay nation, but that the separation took place prior to the introduction of Mohammedism among the islanders of the Indian archipelago. Their connexion with the great Hindoo family is sufficiently established by both their physiological and philological marks of relationship. Their laws, their literature, and some of their religious notions and traditions, seem to be the monuments of a much more advanced state of civilization, from which they have gradually declined. Their reverence for their ancestors is possibly not without foundation : they are the dregs of a nobler race. Their ignorance in navigation is, in islanders, not a little remarkable, and strikingly distinguishes them from the Malays ; it has contributed also to insulate them and keep them from foreign admixture. Neither Christians nor Mohammedans appear ever to have obtained access to them. Their language is believed to be the most ancient in Sumatra, and its apparent connexion with the Sungskrit would favour this supposition. Altogether, there is a 'rude genuineness' attaching to their character, which marks them as a distinct and original race ; and, with the exception of their cannibal practices,* they may even be considered as a favourable specimen of human nature left to obey the universal tendency to deterioration, which, in the absence of any correct notions of religion, is exhibited in the history of all barbarous nations. Public communities, like the human mind itself, never remain stationary. A retrograde movement necessarily ensues, where there is no advancement. Idolatry, itself a corruption of the truth, becomes more and more corrupted, and its latest forms are always found to be the worst. This gradual corruption is very apparent in the Hindoo polytheism, and its distinct stages may almost be traced in the chronology of its pantheon. Hence, the irreconcilable discordances of its mythology, and the degradation of the primary deities, who become lost in their ava-

* Dr. Leyden was led to believe that the Bataks eat their aged and infirm relations as 'a pious ceremony. Thus, when a man becomes aged and infirm, he is said to invite his own children to eat him in the season when salt and limes are cheapest.' For this incredible story, there seems to be no foundation.

tars and modifications. Something of this kind has evidently taken place in the religion of the Bataks; and the wooden image which they swear by, and which seems unconnected with their idolatrous traditions, is, probably, the solitary vestige of a more simple and ancient faith, of which every other trace is lost.

Art. IV. *The Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries*: illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian. By John, Bishop of Bristol, 8vo. pp. 599. Price 12s. 6d. Cambridge. 1826.

THERE seems to be a strange perversity in the minds of German literati. Their philosophers patronize mysticism, while their theologians are for reducing matters of the greatest 'pith and moment,' to the lowest degree of speculative insignificance. The facts of Christianity are stripped of all that would raise them above the dead level of common and daily experience, while its doctrines are lowered down to the freezing temperature of heathen ethics. Its celestial sanctions are neutralized; its supernatural evidences are explained away; its heavenly influences and divine communions are treated as the mere excitements of credulity; and all that gives to it its peculiar character and its special validity, is dismissed, with scant courtesy, as the self-cozenage of the visionary, or the feverish imaginations of delirious fanaticism. All this is set forth with great parade of criticism, and a studious exhibition of the forms, at least, of argument; while the substance of the one, and the genuine principles of the other, are miserably outraged.

Much of this misdirected industry is, probably, assignable to the systematic and servile cultivation of habits of elementary inquiry, entailing a consequent inability to venture safely beyond the mere rudiments of theological science. These partial inquirers are perpetually mistaking paradox for profundity, and sterile innovation for enlightened and liberal sentiment. They fail at the outset, inasmuch as they take no account of the moral exigencies of human nature. The manifestations of the Divine glory, and the illustrations of the Divine character, as exhibited in the gospel, do not adapt themselves to their critical canons; and instead of questioning the soundness of their own views, or the justness of their reasoning, they quietly take to pieces the whole evangelical system, that they may reconstruct it by their own hypothesis. There is nothing more mischievous than synthetic argumentation, in matters of eternal concern; nothing in which it more behoves us to make a large and impartial induction, than in *the things which belong to our*

peace. *This*, these self-complacent men *willingly are ignorant of*, that human nature is labouring under the oppression of moral disorder, and that the Bible, the word of God, contains the only authentic definition of the malady and its cure. And the statements of Revelation on these points, are fully sustained and corroborated by the appeal to fact and circumstance. The further we carry our researches into all that is within us and around us, the stronger will be the demonstration, and the more lively our conviction of the great truths set forth in the holy oracles, and realized by the renewed mind, through faith which is in Christ.

But this neutralizing process in respect to the Scriptures themselves, does not appear to be sufficient. It must be carried further, and applied to the collateral evidences and illustrations, as well as to the essentials of the system. John Solomon Semler—a name of considerable note in Biblical criticism—published, at various dates from 1770 to 1776, an edition of *Tertullian* in six volumes, small octavo, with an amended text, prefaces, various readings, brief occasional notes, and copious indexes. The work is well done; the print, though both typography and paper are somewhat coarse, is very readable; the form is commodious, and the apparatus, especially the indices, extremely valuable. Semler seems rather to have superintended the recension, than to have been specifically its author, since he acknowledges his obligations in this respect, to the efficient and successive services of Sybel, Schutz, and Windorf. In fact, excepting general inspection, he appears to have contributed little beyond three or four prefaces to the different volumes, and a dissertation of considerable length and detail, which will presently claim from us a further reference. Were we not ourselves somewhat vexatiously experienced in the uncertainties of literary men, as well as in their proneness to make frivolous excuses for idleness or inefficient service, we should say, that there was something almost ridiculous in the repeated change of agent and of plan. It seems to have been first intended to publish the books against Marcion, with various readings; then the scheme was made to include all the works of *Tertullian*, accompanied by a series of '*Tertullianean Disputations*,' which were to illustrate the early history of the church; an explanatory index was then promised, to be compiled by the '*clarissimus*' Schutz, and, after all, if we understand the matter rightly, it was compiled by the '*doctissimus*' Windorf. The *Disputations* dwindled down into a single dissertation, containing certain very absurd speculations; and these provoked the animadversions of the '*eruditissimus*' Walch, whose comments seem to have settled the matter, since Semler

makes no other reply than a miserable excuse about the impatience of the press. Notwithstanding these changes in the management, the edition is, as we have before intimated, valuable and convenient, and may advantageously supersede any of its predecessors, with the exception of Rigaltius. Pamelius is a wordy commentator; a defect from which even Rigaltius cannot be considered as entirely exempt. With the editions of the ecclesiastics Georges and La Cerda, we have no acquaintance, but we infer from Du Pin's description, that they are utterly worthless.

But to resume the subject from which the greater part of the preceding paragraph is a digression. Semler, in the dissertation to which we have already referred, undertakes to prove, that the works of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian, are altogether spurious; and that, instead of being the compositions of the individuals whose names they bear, they are the productions of a sort of club or committee, instituted for the express purpose of executing this kind of forgeries. Nothing can surpass in debility, the reasoning by which he endeavours to prop this ill-constructed hypothesis; and we regret our inability to cite the whole of the acute and satisfactory investigation which the Bishop of Bristol has employed in demolition of this strange and dangerous theory—dangerous, not from its immediate character or effects, but from its remote consequences. Let it be once granted that similarity of argument and phrase, is a sufficient reason for assigning the works of the authors in question to some ancient society of hackney scribblers in the Roman Grub-street, and the next inference will be, that at least three out of the four evangelists were got up at some similar workshop, in the Paternoster-Row or Little-Britain of Jerusalem. So weak, in fact, are some of the arguments assigned by Semler, that it is scarcely possible to believe him in earnest while stating them. In one instance, having put a forced and untenable meaning on an expression of Jerome's, he supposes the latter to affirm that Tertullian was the first *presbyter* who employed the Latin language as a medium of composition, and then inquires:

'How can Tertullian be called the first *presbyter* who used the Latin language, when he himself says that he composed several treatises in Greek? I must,' writes the Bishop, 'confess myself at a loss to discover the slightest inconsistency between the two statements. If an author composes three treatises in Greek, and two or three and twenty in Latin, may he not with propriety be classed among Latin writers? It is probable that Jerome had never met with Tertullian's Greek composition; it is nearly certain that Eusebius had not.'

'The mention of Irenæus leads me to consider another of Semler's objections. "Who," he asks, "can read the works of Irenæus which are now extant, without being convinced that the author was alike deficient in talent and information? Yet Tertullian has designated him as a minute enquirer into all kinds of learning (or doctrine). Does not this grossly inapplicable eulogium clearly bespeak the sophist and declaimer?" To this objection we reply, that we are scarcely competent to form an opinion respecting the talent of Irenæus from a work which, with the exception of part of the first book and some scattered fragments, is extant, not in the original, but in a barbarous Latin translation. From the portions of the original which still remain, we should infer that he possessed one of the most useful qualifications of an author, that of being able to write perspicuously upon a very obscure and unpromising subject. What ground, moreover, is there for supposing that Tertullian, in pronouncing this eulogium upon Irenæus, referred only to the single work, now extant, against the Gnostics? Eusebius gives a list of other works written by him; and uniformly speaks of him as a person, to whose authority great weight was attached in all Ecclesiastical concerns.

'But Tertullian, it seems, was not content with praising, he also borrowed from Irenæus, and that too without acknowledgement. His treatise against the Valentinians is not merely an imitation, it is in many places a translation of the first book of that author's work; yet he gives not the slightest intimation of the source from which he has drawn so largely. How are we to account for this extraordinary fact? Only, as Semler would persuade us, by adopting his theory, that there existed a club of authors who "sent forth their own productions into the world under borrowed names; and appeared at one time as the Greek Irenæus, at another as the Latin Tertullian." But if this were so, whence arises the great inequality which Semler himself has discovered between them? How comes it that, while the works of Tertullian exhibit such an extent and variety of knowledge, those of Irenæus, according to Semler, betray a miserable poverty of intellect and learning?

'The close resemblance between Tertullian and Irenæus in the case alluded to, may, in our opinion, be satisfactorily accounted for. The design of the first book of Irenæus, and of Tertullian's treatise, is precisely the same—to explain the doctrine of the Valentinians respecting the generation of Æons: and thus, the common subject of the two writers would naturally lead them to pursue the same order, and almost to use the same language. Most strange, indeed, is Semler's assertion, that Tertullian has not even named Irenæus, whom he has named, even in the very passage which Semler quotes, in conjunction with Justin, Miltiades, and Proculus. He there states, that all these writers had refuted the Valentinians; and declares that it is his earnest wish to imitate them, not only in this work of faith (the refutation of heresy) but in all others. He has, therefore, told his reader, as plainly as he could, that in this treatise he is only an imitator; and his occasional deviations from the statement of Irenæus

convince me that he did not borrow from him alone, but also from the other writers whom he has mentioned.'

But enough of Semler and his vagaries;—it is time that we turn to the immediate subject of this article, which we shall introduce with Jerome's account of Tertullian.

'Tertullian, a presbyter, the first Latin writer after Victor and Apollonius, was a native of the province of Africa and city of Carthage, the son of a proconsular centurion: he was a man of a sharp and vehement temper, flourished under Severus and Antoninus Caracalla, and wrote numerous works, which, as they are generally known, I think it unnecessary to particularize. I saw at Concordia in Italy, an old man named Paulus. He said that, when young, he had met at Rome with an aged amanuensis of the blessed Cyprian, who told him that Cyprian never passed a day without reading some portion of Tertullian's works, and used frequently to say, *Give me my master*, meaning Tertullian. After remaining a presbyter of the church until he had attained the middle age of life, Tertullian was, by the envy and contumelious treatment of the Roman clergy, driven to embrace the opinions of Montanus, which he has mentioned in several of his works under the title of the New Prophecy; but he composed, expressly against the Church, the Treatises de Pudicitia, de Persecutione, de Jejuniis, de Monogamiâ, and six books de Ecstasi, to which he added a seventh against Apollonius. He is reported to have lived to a very advanced age, and to have composed many other works which are not extant.'

Such is the meagre outline which includes all that we know of a man, who stood high in the estimation of his contemporaries, and whose writings have obtained from posterity a more qualified admiration. Much controversy has arisen on particular points; as, for instance, the reconciliation of his office as a presbyter, with the unquestionable fact of his marriage, so as to render these circumstances compatible with the clerical celibacy enjoined by the Church of Rome. Other difficulties have been started, but none of them sufficiently weighty to require particular attention. The most important incident in the life of this singular man, was the change of sentiment which led to his adoption of the wild notions broached by the heresiarch Montanus. If the expressions of Epiphanius are to be taken literally, this sectarian leader is fairly chargeable with blasphemy, since he is represented as saying—'I am the Lord God who dwell in man.'—'I am no angel or ambassador: I myself, God the Father, am come.' Yet, as the Bishop of Bristol justly observes, these awful phrases could hardly be intended in a literal sense, since Epiphanius himself describes Montanus as sound in the catholic faith respecting the three Persons of the Godhead. Considerable difficulty

prevails respecting the precise nature of the pretensions of this enthusiast. Mosheim, in his 'Commentaries on the Affairs of the Christians before the time of Constantine the Great,' describes him as 'a man of low origin, not naturally inclined to evil, but of a melancholic disposition and infirm judgment,' and 'so disordered in his imagination, as to conceive that the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, or Comforter, by whom the apostles of our blessed Saviour had been animated, had, by divine appointment, descended upon him for the purpose of foretelling things of the greatest moment, that were about to happen, and promulgating a better and more perfect discipline of life and morals, than that which had been built upon the Apostolic mandates.'—(*Vidal's Translation*, vol. ii. pp. 335, 6.) In his Ecclesiastical History, however, he gives a different representation of this matter, and affirms positively, that Tertullian's writings prove, 'with the utmost evidence,' the heresy of Montanus to have consisted in his claim to be considered as the very Paraclete predicted by Christ. He states further, that this heresiarch made a distinction between the Paraclete, and the Holy Spirit given to the disciples at the day of pentecost. The Bishop of Bristol adopts the first of these opinions; and it seems certain, notwithstanding the obscurity and doubtful character of some of Tertullian's expressions, that although Montanus was a man of extravagant pretensions, put forth in still more extravagant language, his morals were unimpeachable, and his innovations tended mainly to introduce a more rigid discipline into the church. On this point, we believe, that ecclesiastical writers are agreed. Du Pin expressly states that, concerning the rule of faith, 'Tertullian and the earlier Montanists held with the church;' and the excellent Tillemont, in his discussions on this subject, can find no other indication of heresy, than the mere circumstance of ecclesiastical separation. It is amusing to mark the conflict between the bigotry and kind-heartedness of Tillemont on this occasion. His reason and his charity are clearly on the side of Tertullian and the Montanists, but, as a true son of the Church, his orthodoxy is up in arms at the slightest infringement of her claims, and he consigns, without hesitation, men whose piety is without impeachment—their memories to the brand of heresy, and their immortal spirits to its pains and penalties. Daillé, than whom it would be difficult to cite a higher authority in these matters, says expressly of Tertullian, that 'his Montanism put no separation at all betwixt him and other Christians, save only in point of discipline, which he, according to the severity of his nature, would have to be most harsh and rigorous. For, as for his doctrine, it is very

‘evident, that he constantly kept to the very same rule, and the same faith, that the catholics did; whence proceeded that tart speech of his,—“that people rejected Montanus, Maximilla, and Priscilla, not because they had any whit departed from the rule of faith, but rather because they would have us to fast oftener than to marry.”’ We have been the more particular in the citation of authorities on this subject, since it appears to us strikingly illustrative both of the absurdity and the despotism involved in the system of Rome. Nothing can be charged on Tertullian worse than a few unguarded and inconsequential expressions, with the exception of his anxiety for the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline, more particularly in the multiplication of fasts and the inhibition of second marriages. And yet for this, the excess only of sanctity, and which, with some slight difference of circumstances, would have given him a place in the calendar, he is turned out of the almanack, and his bones, which would else have figured in shrines and reliquaries, have been left to their quiet sepulture. With singular inconsistency, his authority as a writer stands high among Romanists. In the sermons especially of the French divines, no name, excepting that of St. Augustine, occurs so frequently as that of Tertullian; and, unless our memory fail us, they make no great scruple of levying contributions even on those of his works which lie under the imputation of heretical pravity.

The very interesting volume before us originated in the official exercises of the Author as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and contains the substance of a course of lectures delivered in the Lent and Easter Terms of 1825. Having, in two previous courses, illustrated the writings of the earlier Fathers, in the way of biography, analysis, and application to the doctrines and discipline of the English Establishment, he pursued a different plan with respect to Tertullian, by availing himself of the arrangement adopted by Mosheim from the Centuriators of Magdeburgh. His chapters are entitled—1. On Tertullian and his writings. 2. On the External History of the Church. 3. On the State of Letters and Philosophy. 4. On the Government of the Church. 5. On the Doctrine of the Church. 6. On the Ceremonies used in the Church. 7. Concerning the Heresies and Divisions which troubled the Church. Our readers will perceive that all this, if judiciously managed, must convey an adequate knowledge of that state of things with which Tertullian might in any way be connected. We are glad that a work so important has fallen into such competent hands, and we hope that this may not be the last volume of the same kind from the

same quarter. Of matter so varied and so complicated as that which lies before us, we cannot, of course, pretend to give a regular analysis; our remarks must be general; and it has been with this feeling that we have hitherto indulged in a more desultory strain of observation than we might otherwise have been disposed to employ in the examination of a systematic subject. Of the life of Tertullian, we have already given as many details as can, with any certainty, be received as accurate; and we have adverted, with some particularity, to the nature of the schism which he is charged with having supported. We shall now make room for a few comments on the doctrines which this able writer of the African school appears to have deliberately maintained. He was substantially a Trinitarian, and Semler suggests, that he was the first to use or to sanction the word Trinity as a term expressive of the orthodox scheme. At the same time it must be admitted, that he occasionally cites language which is, to say the least, exceedingly deficient in precision, and which sometimes appears to have a favourable aspect towards Arianism. He admits the pre-existence and consubstantiality of the Son, but some of his phrases have been construed to deny the co-eternity of Christ with the Father. On this point, however, the explanations of Bull seem to be quite satisfactory.

On the subject of Original Sin, it is justly observed by the Bishop, that, as the Pelagian controversy had not been agitated in Tertullian's time, it is not to be expected that he should use the same precision of phrase which would have been necessary under different circumstances. Still, even with this reserve, his language is unguarded. Admitting the 'corrupt origin' of human nature, and its further deterioration through the machinations of the evil one, he yet contends that

'there is a portion of good in the soul; of that original, divine, and genuine good which is its proper nature. For that which is derived from God is rather obscured, than extinguished. It may be obscured, because it is not God: but it cannot be extinguished, because it emanates from God. As, therefore, light, when intercepted by an opaque body, still remains, though it is not seen; so the good in the soul, being weighed down by the evil, is either not seen at all, or is partially and occasionally visible. Men differ widely in their moral characters, yet the souls of all form but one genus: in the worst there is something good; in the best there is something bad. For God alone is without sin; and the only man without sin is Christ, since Christ is God. Thus the divine nature of the soul bursts forth in prophetic anticipations, the consequences of its original good: and conscious of its origin, it bears testimony to God its author, in exclamations like these—*Deus bonus est, Deus videt, Deo commendo*. As no soul is without sin, neither is any without the seeds of good.

Moreover, when the soul embraces the true faith, being renewed in its second birth by water and the power from above, then, the veil of its former corruption being taken away, it beholds the light in all its brightness. As in its first birth it was received by the unholy, in its second, it is received by the Holy Spirit. The flesh follows the soul now wedded to the Spirit, as a part of the bridal portion; no longer the servant of the soul, but of the Spirit. O happy marriage, if no violation of the marriage vow takes place !

The Bishop of Bristol seems to think that this is a tolerably accurate view of the Scripture doctrine, and that it differs little from the Ninth Article of his Church. We differ from him on both points, but it would occupy more time and space than it suits us at present to bestow, were we to enter at large into the reasons of our dissent. We cannot, however, pass by the following sentences, forming part of his comment on the foregoing passage.

‘ Had our author admitted the total corruption of human nature—had he used the language which is sometimes used in our own day, that man is wholly the offspring of the devil—his adversary Marcion might have turned round upon him and said, “ This is my doctrine, for I affirm that man was made by a being distinct from the Supreme God, and at variance with him.” ’

We cannot recognise in this passage the general candour and uniform good sense which distinguish the volume before us. Neither can we discover any necessary connexion between a belief of the total corruption of human nature, and the assertion that man is the offspring of the devil. There seems indeed somewhat of an Irishism in the hypothesis, that *human* nature can be of diabolic birth. It was, however, necessary that it should be thus stated, with a happy mixture of awkwardness and disingenuousness, that the doctrine of man's entire depravity might be classed with the clumsy heresy of Marcion.

‘ Tertullian's notions on free-will—the subject of the Tenth Article of our Church—may be collected from a passage in his *Treatise de Animâ*. He is arguing against the Valentinians, who maintained that men were of three kinds, spiritual, animal, and terrestrial—and that, as this distinction took place at their birth, it was consequently immutable: as a thorn cannot produce figs, or a thistle grapes, an animal man cannot produce the works of the Spirit; or the contrary. “ If this were so,” answers Tertullian, “ God could neither out of stones raise up sons to Abraham, nor could the generation of vipers bring forth the fruits of repentance; and the Apostle was in error when he wrote, *Ye were once darkness, and we also were once by nature the children of wrath, and ye were of the same number, but now ye have been washed.* The declarations of Scripture are never at

variance with each other;—a bad tree will not produce good fruit, unless a graft is made upon it; and a good tree will bring forth bad fruit, unless it is cultivated; and stones will become the sons of Abraham, if they are formed into the faith of Abraham; and the generation of vipers will bring forth the fruits of repentance, if they cast out the poison of a malignant nature. Such is the power of Divine grace; being stronger than nature, and having subject to itself the free power of the will within us, which the Greeks call αὐτεξουσίαν. This power is natural and changeable; consequently, in what direction soever it turns, it turns in that direction by nature. For we have already shewn, that man possesses by nature freedom of will.”

It is not very easy to ascertain with precision, Tertullian's opinion on this intricate subject. A passage referred to by the Bishop, implies the denial of a self-determining power in the will; and it is evident that he entirely held with the sentiment that ascribes conversion solely to the operation of grace; but, so far as we have examined his writings with a view to this subject, he appears to have fallen into the common error of not keeping in view the distinction between free-will and free-agency. On the important doctrine of Justification, there will be found in the works of Tertullian, the same mixture of essential truth with unguarded expression, that is common to him with others of the Fathers.

‘What I remarked,’ observes the present Commentator, ‘with respect to the doctrine of Original Sin, is equally applicable to that of Justification—the subject of the Eleventh Article of our Church. No controversy on the subject existed in Tertullian's time. That which occupied so large a portion of St. Paul's attention, the dispute respecting the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual as a means of justification, appears to have died away immediately after the expulsion of the Jews by Adrian. We must not, therefore, expect in Tertullian's language, when he speaks on this subject, the precision of controversy. He describes, however, the death of Christ as the whole weight and benefit of the Christian name, and the foundation of man's salvation. He says, in one place, that we are redeemed by the blood of God; in another, by the blood of the Lord and the Lamb. He asserts, that such is the efficacy of the blood of Christ, that it not only cleanses men from sin, and brings them out of darkness into light, but preserves them also in a state of purity, if they continue to walk in the light.’

Tertullian, however, in this matter, as in others, is not always prudent in his phraseology. Thus, though he speaks at one time decidedly of penitence as *ex fide justificatam*, and of believers as *ex fide jam justificandos sine ordine legis*, at another, he seems to allow a positive efficacy to repentance, and a qualified merit to bodily mortifications. In the case of martyrdom, he distinctly affirms its expiatory virtue, but restricting

it to the person of the martyr himself, and expressly denying to it an efficacy of supererogation.

We must at present decline to enter on the much agitated questions, as connected with the evidence of Tertullian, concerning the discipline of the primitive Church. The discussion involves so much of statement and counter-statement, so much chaffering about what he wrote or did not write previously to what is termed his separation from the Church, that it would require not merely an article, but a treatise; besides exacting from us a far more minute examination of Tertullian than will now suit us. Recollections and occasional references may be enough for general purposes, but steady and consecutive reading is required for accurate deduction. We have sometimes been amazed at the effrontery with which some writers will give an authoritative opinion on documents of which the tenor, if they had fairly ascertained it, they would have found in direct and obvious contradiction to their assertions. This is not a favourite game with us, and we should be least of all inclined to exercise it in connexion with a work of which every page exhibits marks of diligent and enlightened study. The following paragraph will, however, supply us with the materials of a brief comment.

‘We form,’ writes Tertullian, (as cited by the Bishop,) ‘a body; being joined together by a community of religion, of discipline, and of hope. In our assemblies we meet to offer up our united supplications to God—to read the Scriptures—to deliver exhortations—to pronounce censures, cutting off from communion in prayer and every holy exercise, those who have been guilty of any flagrant offence. The older members, men of tried piety and prudence, preside; having obtained the dignity, not by purchase, but by acknowledged merit. If any collection is made at our meetings, it is perfectly voluntary: each contributes according to his ability, either monthly, or as often as he pleases. These contributions we regard as a sacred deposit; not to be spent in feasting and gluttony, but in maintaining or burying the poor, and relieving the distresses of the orphan, the aged, or the shipwrecked mariner. A portion is also appropriated to the use of those who are suffering in the cause of religion, who are condemned to the mines, or banished to the islands, or confined in prisons.’

It is to be regretted that the Bishop's plan did not, by requiring from him a close representation of his original, induce him to give a series of extracts, which should answer the double purpose of historical illustration and specific example. The preceding paragraph is collected, with entire fidelity but with much freedom of rendering, rather than translated, and all its Tertullianisms evaporate in the transfer. The peculiar and, as

it appears to us, extremely beautiful figure expressed in the second sentence: is deliberately abandoned,—*coimus in coetum et congregationem, ut ad Deum, quasi manu facta, precationibus ambiamus*. This, however, by the way; our present and more urgent business is, to point out the very important indications furnished by this interesting passage, concerning the general character of the primitive Church. It might, in fact, be taken for the description of a church of Independents, and certainly answers as little as possible to the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Establishment. Bingham, indeed, chooses to give, without any explanation, ‘*The Bishops and Presbyters*,’ as the equivalent of ‘*Probati quique Seniores*,’ fairly enough translated in the preceding extract, ‘*the older members, men of tried piety and prudence* ;’ but such dealing as this can never aid a failing cause, and the Author of the present volume exposes it in a note. We could, however, have wished for a greater accuracy of translation in similar matters, on the part of the Bishop of Bristol himself. The paragraph just cited from Tertullian gives a representation of the state and system of the Church, as completely at variance with the claims and gradations of a hierarchy as can well be conceived. Yes, says the Bishop, but he elsewhere bears testimony, not only to the existence of a distinction between the clergy and laity, but

‘also to the existence of a distinction of orders among the clergy. One of his charges against the heretics is, that they neglected this distinction. “With them,” he says, “one man is a Bishop to-day, another to-morrow; he who is to-day a Deacon, will be to-morrow a Reader; he who is a priest to-day, will to-morrow be a layman.” In the Tracts de Baptismo and de Fugâ in Persecutione, three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are enumerated together; and in the former, the superior authority of the Bishop is expressly asserted.’

Now the whole of this peremptory paragraph derives its plausibility from mistranslation. For *Priest* and *Deacon*, read *Elder* and *Steward*, and the affair assumes a different aspect altogether. ‘The superior authority of the Bishop,’ too, is a high-sounding phrase, but a glance at the original abates much of its loftiness. It does, indeed, assign the administration of Baptism, first, to the ‘*Episcopus*,’ or Pastor, after him to the *Presbyteri* (Elders), and to the *Diaconi* (Stewards). These are further enjoined not to baptise without the authority of the Pastor, not as a matter of absolute discipline, but *propter Ecclesie honorem*.

We had intended to put together a few critical observations on the character and writings of Tertullian, but the task has been so ably done by a writer of uncommon talents,

that we prefer translating the following paragraphs from Malebranche.

‘Tertullian was, in truth, a man of profound learning, but his memory was stronger than his judgement, and he had more keenness and extent of imagination, than penetration and scope of intellect. It is, in fact, beyond all doubt, that he was a visionary in all the modes that I have previously explained, and that he was in possession of almost all the qualities which I have attributed to visionaries. The veneration which he avowed for the dreams of Montanus and the prophetesses, is an incontestable evidence of the weakness of his judgement. This fire, these extravagancies, these enthusiasms about little things, mark sensibly the derangement of his imagination. His hyperboles and figures are full of eccentricity, and he deals largely in pompous and magnificent arguments, whose only force of proof lies in their brilliancy, and which have the effect of persuasion, only by bewildering and dazzling the mind.

‘What, for instance, does it avail this author,—when vindicating himself from the charge of impropriety in assuming the philosophic mantle, instead of the ordinary robe,—to tell us that the mantle in question was formerly of common use in the city of Carthage? Is it allowable at present to wear the ruff and trencher-cap, because they were the fashion of our fathers? And do women now-a-days wear hoods and farthingales, except at the carnival or masquerade?

‘What is to be inferred from all those lofty and magnificent descriptions of the changes which happen in the world, and what have they to do with his justification? The moon changes in its phases, the year in its seasons; the fields change their aspect in winter and summer. Inundations drown whole provinces; and earthquakes swallow them up. New cities are built, new colonies established; national invasions have devastated entire countries; in fine, all nature is subject to change.—Therefore he was in the right when he laid aside the robe to assume the mantle! What connexion is there between what he had to prove and all these variations, as well as a hundred others, that he hunts out with petty diligence, and describes in language forced, obscure, and affected? The peacock changes at every step, the serpent hides himself in a hole to change his skin—therefore Tertullian did right to change his cloak. Is it possible that any one can coolly and quietly draw such conclusions; or could they be listened to without laughter, unless this author had the art of confounding and entangling his reader?

‘Almost all the remainder of this little book, *de Pallio*, is full of reasons quite as far-fetched as these; which, assuredly, can only prove by embarrassing those who allow themselves to be embarrassed. But it is useless to dwell longer on such a subject. It will be enough to say, in this place, that if sound judgement, clear and terse expression, are the proper qualities of composition when the exhibition of truth is its primary object, it will be impossible to suggest any excuse for a writer who, in the opinion even of Salmasius, the greatest critic of our time, has used his utmost efforts to make himself obscure,

and who has so completely succeeded in his intention, that his commentator was ready to swear, that nobody ever understood him perfectly. But, allowing that the genius of his nation, the fashionable caprice of the day, or the nature of satire and raillery, may justify to a certain extent this marvellous disposition to write obscurely and incomprehensibly; still, nothing of all this will excuse the miserable reasoning and eccentricities of an author, who, in many others of his works, as well as in this, gives utterance to all that comes into his mind, provided that it be something out of the common track, and that he have in readiness some hazarded phrase by which he may make a parade of the force, or, to speak more appropriately, the derangement of his imagination.

Recherche de la Verité, vol. 1. pp. 256—8. Amsterdam. 1688.

We cannot dismiss this volume without again expressing a hope that it may not be the last of the kind from the same pen.

Art. V. *A New Family Bible, and Improved Version, from corrected Texts of the Originals; with Notes, critical and explanatory; and short practical Reflections on each Chapter: together with A General Introduction, on the Authenticity and Inspiration of the Sacred Books; and a complete View of the Mosaic Laws, Rites, and Customs.* By the Rev. B. Boothroyd, L.L.D. Vol. III. 4to. Huddersfield. 1825.

MANY of the modern Apologists of the Romish Church have laboured to shew, that the spirit and laws of their community are favourable, or at least are not unfavourable, to the diffusion of religious knowledge, and that the circulation and use of the Holy Scriptures, in the vernacular languages, are quite in accordance with the regulations and wishes of its rulers. In support of their representations, they refer us to the Biblical labours of the learned of their Church, and to the various translations of the Scriptures which have been published by its members. It is not, however, by accumulated details and examples of such services, that these advocates of the Church of Rome can silence the accusations of her Protestant opponents, when they charge her with the guilt of prohibiting and restricting the use of the Bible. The systematic hostility of her rulers to the free circulation of the Scriptures, is established by evidence, historical and documentary, which cannot be invalidated; and whatever may be the inclinations or the practice of some individuals within her pale, the Church itself has been uniformly averse from the public instruction of mankind by means of the Scriptures, rendered generally accessible by being translated for the use of the unlearned. 'Holy church and the governors thereof have not by public authority prescribed,

‘commanded, or authentically ever recommended any vulgar version of Scripture to be indifferently used of all men;’ but they have enacted by decree, that ‘the Holy Scriptures may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than such as have express license thereunto of their lawful ordinaries :’—thus claiming as a monopoly, the possession of the sacred volume, to be withheld as they please, and in their hands to be subject to a dispensation of control and favour. It is exceedingly curious to observe the proceedings of ‘Holy Church and the governors thereof’ in the exercise of this restrictive and permissive authority. As one example, we may adduce the following reasons assigned by the Rhemish Translators of the Vulgate, in the preface to their Version. ‘Which translation,’ they say, ‘we do not for all that publish, upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought or were ordained by God to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth or heareth them in a known language : or that they were not often, through man’s malice or infirmity, pernicious and much hurtful to many : or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God’s word and honour or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical learned languages : Not for these, nor any such like causes, do we translate this sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which, divers things are either necessary, or profitable and medicinal now, that otherwise in the peace of the Church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable.’ In accordance with the temper and language of this paragraph, ‘the governors of Holy Church,’ in one of their earliest denunciations against the translators of the Bible into the vernacular tongue, pronounce it to be, ‘a dangerous thing, as the blessed Jerome testifieth, to translate the text of the Holy Scriptures out of one language into another, because it is not always easy to retain the sense of the originals in a translation ; as the same blessed Jerome confesseth, that although inspired, he frequently erred ;’ and they enact and ordain, that no one hereafter do by his own authority translate any text of Holy Scripture into English, and that no one read such translated books.

In remarking on these passages, it is not in the least necessary to expose the sophistry or the futility of the reasons which they contain : their imbecillity is too evident to stand in need of any comment. But there is one use to be made of them, which most effectually establishes the very principle which they

are intended to destroy. It was not to be supposed that the pretensions of the Church of Rome, in her assumed character of guardian of the sacred records, could respect any other charge than the custody of the *original* Scriptures. Because it would be absurd to imagine that, if such a delegation were made, any other writings should be committed as a deposit to her trust, than those which contained the very words in which the communications of a Divine revelation were at first given. If it be a dangerous thing to translate the text of the Holy Scriptures out of one language into another;—if an inspired translator, as Jerome is absurdly represented as being, confesses that he has frequently erred;—the Church which claims the possession and guardianship of the Sacred Writings, cannot be supposed to be keeping in her custody a translation of them, instead of the originals. This, however, is the fact. She knows nothing of the originals. They were never lodged in her hands, or committed to her care. The Latin Bible alone is sanctioned by her, which, every one knows, is not the original, but a translation. Every reason which her advocates assign against either the authority or the utility of translations, applies to the version which she sanctions. The Latin language was not an ecclesiastical and learned language at the date of the publication of the several books which are contained in the Bible; it was the common language of the Romans. If, therefore, it be not more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, and more to the edification of the faithful, that the Scriptures should be turned into vulgar tongues, they ought to have been kept and studied in the ecclesiastical languages in which they first existed.

When the Bible was first translated into the Latin language, it was not translated for the purpose of being given to any ecclesiastical body for their use and benefit, and to be exclusively at their disposal. It was accessible in that form to every reader of the language of Rome. The Latin versions were public versions of the Scriptures, prepared for common use, and generally and freely circulated. They were employed in the service of the Church, because they were understood by the people. It was only in the gradual decline and disuse of the Latin language, that the governors of the Romish Church found the opportunity of which they so artfully availed themselves, of monopolizing the Scriptures. It was never their policy to encourage the diffusion of the word of life among the people, who were permitted to sink into the ignorance which had been already discovered to be most favourable to the establishment of the spiritual dominion that they were labouring to advance. As other languages prevailed in the countries

where Latin had been in common use, the Latin version was no longer of public utility, but became a clerical monopoly, and was thus indebted to accidental circumstances for the distinction which it obtained in the Church of Rome. But by this very adoption of a version formerly made for the public use, and widely circulating with the most perfect freedom, the Church of Rome is furnishing a perpetual testimony to the primitive practice, and is giving the most irrefragable proof that the Holy Scriptures are not a deposit committed to her trust and control. It is curious that her advocates should allege the danger of translating the Scriptures, in opposing the circulation of them by Protestants, and yet, that the Church should claim to be the guardian of the Scriptures, not in their originals, but in a translation.

On the desertion of this country by the Romans, the cultivation of literature was neglected, and the Latin versions of the Scriptures became circumscribed in their circulation, till they were no longer in request among the people. With the invasions and subsequent settlement of the Saxons, a new language was introduced. Originally pagan idolaters, the character of this new race was, in time, greatly changed; and for their use, after their reception of Christianity, the Saxon versions of the Scriptures were made. These versions generally included no more than the Gospels; and though other portions of the Bible were translated by different individuals, no complete Saxon version of the whole Bible appears to have existed. The Danish invasions were fatal to the progress of Saxon literature, and the Norman conquest proved still more disastrous, as it changed not only the political state of the country, but its language, which gradually passed into that form in which it has continued to the present times.

The English language in what may be termed its transitive state, towards the close of the twelfth century, was exceedingly rude, nor does it seem to have been employed in literal Biblical translation before the fourteenth century. This was the age of the illustrious Wiclif. To this ornament of our country belongs the honour of commencing an effective reformation of religion; and of employing, as the principal means of promoting it, the light of revealed truth. To publish the entire Scriptures in the vernacular languages, was a bold undertaking for an individual to attempt in those times, however gifted and patronised he might be. This laborious work, he successfully executed, and raised the fiercest opposition of the Church against him by the publication of his English Translation in 1380, but a few years before his death. It was denounced as a horrible innovation, and even the readers of it in-

curred the forfeiture of land, cattle, and goods. The favourers of this measure were violently persecuted; they were declared heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and traitors to the land. Other English translations of the Scriptures, though none of the whole Bible, had, however, already been made previously to Wiclif's celebrated publication. He was the principal, but not the first, English translator of the Holy Scriptures.

Of the English versions of the Scriptures which existed previously to Wiclif's age, and which appear to have comprised only parts of the Bible, we transcribe, from Lewis, the following specimen, with which he was furnished by Dr. Waterland, from a M.S. in the library of Bennet College, Cambridge.

' Mark I. 7. And he prechye sayande, a stalworther thane I schal come efter me of whom I am not worthi downfallande, or knel-ande, to louse the thwonge of his chawcers.'

' VI. 22. When the doughtyr of that Herodias was in comyn and had tombylde and pleside to Harowde, and also to the sittande at mete, the kyng says to the wench.'

' XII. 1. A man made a vynere, and he made aboute a hegge, and grofe a lake and bygedde a tower.'

' XII. 38. Be ye ware of the scribes whylke wille go in stolis and be haylsede in the mārket and for to sit in synagogis in the fyrste chayers.'

These passages appear in the following form in Wiclif's Translation.

' And prechye and seyde a strengre than I schal come aftir me and I am not worthi to knele down and unlase his schoon.

' And whanne the doughter of thilke Erodias was comen inne and daunside and pleside to Eroude and also to men that saten at the mete: the kyng sayde to the damsel.'

' A man plauntide a vyneyard and sette an hegge about it and dalf a lake and bildide a tour.'

' Be ye ware of Scribis that wolen wandre in stolis and be saluted in chepyng; and sitte in synagogis in the firste chayeris.'

Wiclif's version of the New Testament, which was first published in a printed edition by Lewis in 1731, is not in the possession of all our readers, and we may probably be gratifying the curiosity of some of them by copying a portion of it for their perusal. The early English versions are important documents in the history of the language.

' Matthew, chap. III. In tho daies Jon Baptist cam, and prechide in the desert of Judee. And seide do ye penaunce for the kingdom of hevenes schal neigh. For this is he of whom it is seid bi Ysaie the prophete seiynge, a voice of a crier in desert, make ye redy the weies

of the Lord, make ye right the pathis of him. And this Jon hadde clothing of Camels heris and a girdle of skyn aboute his Leendis and his mete was hony soukis and hony of the wode. Thanne wente Jerusalem out to him and all Judee and alle the cuntree aboute Jordan. And thei weren waischen of him in Jordan, and knowlechiden her synnes. But he sigh many of the Farisees and of Saduceis comynge to his bapty[m], and seiden to hem generatiouns of Eddris who schewide to you to fle fro wraththe that is to come? Therfor do ye worthi fruytis of penaunce. And nyle ye sey withynne you, we have Abraham to fadir, for i seye to you that God is mighti to reise up of these stones the sones of Abraham. And now the axe is put to the roote of the tree, therfor every tree that makyth not good fruyt schal be kit down and schal be cast into the fyr. I waishe ghou in watir into penaunce, but he that schal come after me is strenger than i whos schon y am not worthi to bere, he schal baptise you in the hooly goost an fire. Whos wynewynge cloth is in his hond, and schal fully clanse his corn flore, and he schall gadre his whete into his berne: but the chaff he schall brenne with fire that may not be quenched.

The first printed English version of the New Testament was Tyndal's Translation, published in 1526. For this version, the original Greek text was used: the preceding translations were executed from the Latin Vulgate. Other versions were afterwards furnished by Coverdale and other English translators, till the time of James I., when the present public version was executed. That this is a faultless version, no one has presumed to maintain, but it has fewer blemishes than some who have attempted to estimate its merits, have been willing to concede. Many frivolous objections have been urged against its renderings, and many alterations proposed, which could not have increased its value if they had been adopted. In many respects, however, it admits of improvement; and in some instances, the amendments which are required, that it may possess the excellence to which every enlightened reader must wish to see it advanced, are of great moment. The attention of numerous scholars has been directed to the revision of the English Bible. The greater number of those who have put forth corrected editions, have limited their labours to the New Testament. Of this, various translations have been at different times submitted to the public, some of which are now almost forgotten: never having obtained any extensive or valuable sanction, they are become instances of the disproportion which is so frequently to be observed in literary undertakings, between the anticipated and the real acceptance of a publication. Others are more remarkable as objects of curiosity, than deserving of praise for being improvements upon the versions which they were intended to supersede or to rival.

As specimens of the manner in which some translators

have allowed themselves to proceed in rendering the text of the New Testament, we might lay before our readers a series of extracts from Mace's version, published in 1729; but, as we intend to advert more largely to another still more signal instance of improper proceeding in a translator, we must be sparing in our selections from Mace's work. The following are examples of very reprehensible modes of expression. Matthew xxii. 35, 'that he had dumbfounded the Saducees.' xxv. 21, 'enter in and partake of thy master's diversions.' Luke i. 67, 'Zecharias vented his divine enthusiasm.' xix. 2, 'the collector-general of the customs.' Acts viii. 10, 'the plenipotentiary of God.' Heb. vii. 22, 'the guarantee of the alliance.' James v. 4, 'Lord of the celestial militia.' It is difficult to reconcile the introduction of these expressions into a Biblical version with honest purpose or sobriety of mind. The first impression which a reader receives from them, is decidedly unfavourable to the translator's sincerity. The burlesque appearance which such phrases present, must at all events waken the suspicion, that their Author was not solicitous to preserve the genuine character of the sacred diction.

Dr. Harwood's liberal translation of the New Testament is, however, still more faulty than the preceding version, and is executed in a manner which is seriously offensive. In his attempt to accommodate the language of the sacred writers to the cultivated understandings of modern readers, he has entirely subverted the chaste simplicity of their expressions, and has tricked out the style in which he intended to convey their sentiments, with every ornament of inflated and insipid diction. It would not be easy to select from any book, passages abounding with more flagrant violations of every rule of good writing than the following. The words of the Prophet, cited by the Evangelists Matthew and Mark, are not susceptible of improvement, and must please even the most fastidious reader. "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight" (Matt. iii. 3, Mark i. 3). In the Liberal Translation, we read:—

'Hark! the voice of a public crier in the wilderness, Prepare a way for the Messiah, make an easy path for his sacred steps. Hark! how the wilderness resounds with the loud proclamation! O prepare for the speedy advent of the Messiah. Strew the path with flowers, in which his sacred feet shall tread.'

For "The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up," we have—

'Thine inhabitants who had long been involved in darkness, saw

at once the cheering beams of divine light burst upon them, which dispelled from thy regions the shades of that dense and uncomfortable obscurity which once covered them.'

The inimitably beautiful address of our Lord, Matt. xi. 28, may be compared with Dr. Harwood's paraphrastic version.

'Come unto me, all ye who groan under the insupportable burthen of the ceremonial law—and I will vindicate you into perfect liberty and freedom.

'Obey my doctrines and precepts which I have illustrated and enforced by my own conduct; and learn from my examples of inoffensive meekness and unaffected humility—and you will secure true and lasting peace and happiness.

'For my doctrine is calculated for the felicity of mankind—its injunctions are not rigorous and oppressive to human nature—but the paths into which it introduces men are unspeakably pleasant and delectable.'

Dr. Harwood was a classical scholar, but how little he had gained from his acquaintance with the correct and elegant models of antiquity, may be seen in the form which he has chosen for the pathetic expressions of our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 37, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them who are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!"

'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who hast murdered so many prophets, and hast stoned to death so many good men who were sent to reform thee,—for how many ages have I strove to save thee from ruin with all the anxious care and solicitude of the most affectionate parent!—but you have obstinately refused.'

Matt. xxvi. 39. "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless—" is the language of the 'Man of sorrows,' and speaks to every heart: who that reads it can tolerate the liberal translation which follows?

'O merciful God! suffer not the impending stroke to break over my head;—but I check myself.'

For 'at the rising of the sun,' Mark xvi. 2., we have, 'the rays of the sun now streaking the edge of the horizon.' For 'there shined round about him a light from heaven,' Acts ix. 3. we find, 'a flood of light from the sky poured its effulgent splendours around him.' Mace has given us 'yeoman' for the 'householder' of the Public Version, and in many other examples, he has violated the propriety which a translator of the Scriptures should invariably maintain; but, in faults of this kind, he is at least equalled by Dr. Harwood. 'The young

'lady is not dead.' Mark v. 39. 'The clergyman said to him; you have given, Sir, the only true and proper answer to the question.' xii. 32. 'The immense estates of an opulent gentleman.' Luke xii. 16. 'A gentleman of a splendid fortune and opulent had two sons.' xv. 11. 'This gentleman privately stole to Jesus in the silence of the night.' John iii. 2.

Nothing can be more remote from the manner of the sacred writers than a style like this, which has no one good quality to recommend it, and by its affectation can only repel the class of readers for whose use it appears to have been adopted. The most servilely literal translation is greatly to be preferred to a paraphrastical version so diffuse and tumid as this, which is offensive alike to piety and taste.

Among the very modern translators of the Scriptures who have published English versions of the New Testament, the principal are Wynne, Purver, Worsley, Campbell, Wakefield, Newcome, Macknight, Scarlet, and Doddridge, whose translation in the Family Expositor has been printed in a separate form. Among these, Campbell is entitled to distinct consideration on account of the important body of criticism which he has supplied in his prefixed Dissertations, and in his Notes. Newcome's Version possesses very considerable merit, and is much superior to Wakefield's; and Macknight, with many faults, some of them not unimportant ones, has obtained a permanent reputation on account of the valuable assistance which his work affords to Biblical students. No translator has excelled Campbell in acuteness of understanding and in the nice application of sound and varied learning to the objects of Scriptural criticism. He was eminently felicitous, both in his discernment of the errors and blemishes of his predecessors, and in his appreciation of their merits. No one surpassed him in probity; and though he ought not to be represented as exempt from prejudice, the proofs of its influence are but rarely to be detected, while the instances are frequently occurring of its being successfully opposed by the force of truth. His translation of the Gospels, however, is but little read, and will never become, separately from the critical apparatus which accompanies it, a popular work. It deviates, sometimes, very unnecessarily from the Public Version, and betrays somewhat of an ambitious novelty of phraseology. Obsolete expressions occasionally occur: *ex. gr.* 'carried off seven *maunds*,' Matt. xvi. 37. 'cut down *sprays*,' Mark xi. 8. We have 'heathen,' Matt. vi. 38.; 'gentiles,' x. 6.; and 'pagans,' v. 48.—the last is very improper. We find 'heavenly Father,' Matt. vi. 20. 32, and 'celestial Father,' xviii. 35. In Matt. xxvi. 17., we

have 'paschal supper;' in verse 19., 'passover.' 'He taught 'in their synagogues *with universal applause*,' (Luke iv. 14.,) is too much in Harwood's manner; and 'roared out,' (viii. 28.,) is not better than the 'bawled out' of Mace's version, which Campbell has so severely, but so very justly reprehended. 'My lads, have ye any victuals,' (John xxi. v.,) is not to be approved, though borrowed from Doddridge.

That there should not be an entire agreement of opinion among Biblical writers in respect to the manner in which a version of the Holy Scriptures should be executed, can scarcely appear surprising. It is, however, satisfactory to find so general a concurrence of the most able and judicious critics in favour of a literal translation. The sacred character of the Bible, and the high and solemn importance of its contents, impart to every form in which it is proposed to transmit it the greatest possible interest, and except it from the several kinds of compositions in reference to which a translator may be allowed his option. Every reader of the Bible should, as nearly as it may be practicable, be furnished with its pure and simple text. A version is, to the unlearned, to stand in the place of the original, and should therefore be as conformable to it as possible. It is not enough that the meaning of the sacred writers is conveyed by the translation: the forms and modes of expression in which their sentiments are exhibited, ought also to be preserved. It is frequently of the greatest importance to the correct understanding of the meaning of the sacred writers, that their characteristic and figurative expressions should be exhibited by a translator. Very minute attention, therefore, requires to be given by the author of a version of the Scriptures to the text of his original, as well as to the powers of the vernacular language into which he renders, that he may faithfully and exactly set before his readers the sentiments of the inspired writers in their genuine forms. Perspicuity and simplicity are indispensable requisites in a translation of the Bible, and should never be sacrificed, as they have sometimes been, by the affectation of novelty, and the indulgence of a vitiated taste.

Of the manner in which the Scriptures should be translated into our own language, the Public Version is an approved model; and nothing could be more easy than to extract from it passages which combine in the highest degrees the excellences of precision in sense, and simplicity and elegance in diction. It is with great propriety, therefore, that the most judicious translators have proposed to retain the words of the Public Version in all cases in which they correctly and perspicuously express the sense of the original. Dr. Boothroyd has not pro-

'lady is not dead.' Mark v. 39. 'The clergyman said to him; you have given, Sir, the only true and proper answer to the question.' xii. 32. 'The immense estates of an opulent gentleman.' Luke xii. 16. 'A gentleman of a splendid fortune and opulent had two sons.' xv. 11. 'This gentleman privately stole to Jesus in the silence of the night.' John iii. 2.

Nothing can be more remote from the manner of the sacred writers than a style like this, which has no one good quality to recommend it, and by its affectation can only repel the class of readers for whose use it appears to have been adopted. The most servilely literal translation is greatly to be preferred to a paraphrastical version so diffuse and tumid as this, which is offensive alike to piety and taste.

Among the very modern translators of the Scriptures who have published English versions of the New Testament, the principal are Wynne, Purver, Worsley, Campbell, Wakefield, Newcome, Macknight, Scarlet, and Doddridge, whose translation in the Family Expositor has been printed in a separate form. Among these, Campbell is entitled to distinct consideration on account of the important body of criticism which he has supplied in his prefixed Dissertations, and in his Notes. Newcome's Version possesses very considerable merit, and is much superior to Wakefield's; and Macknight, with many faults, some of them not unimportant ones, has obtained a permanent reputation on account of the valuable assistance which his work affords to Biblical students. No translator has excelled Campbell in acuteness of understanding and in the nice application of sound and varied learning to the objects of Scriptural criticism. He was eminently felicitous, both in his discernment of the errors and blemishes of his predecessors, and in his appreciation of their merits. No one surpassed him in probity; and though he ought not to be represented as exempt from prejudice, the proofs of its influence are but rarely to be detected, while the instances are frequently occurring of its being successfully opposed by the force of truth. His translation of the Gospels, however, is but little read, and will never become, separately from the critical apparatus which accompanies it, a popular work. It deviates, sometimes, very unnecessarily from the Public Version, and betrays somewhat of an ambitious novelty of phraseology. Obsolete expressions occasionally occur: *ex. gr.* 'carried off seven *maunds*,' Matt. xvi. 37. 'cut down *sprays*,' Mark xi. 8. We have 'heathen,' Matt. vi. 38.; 'gentiles,' x. 6.; and 'pagans,' v. 48.—the last is very improper. We find 'heavenly Father,' Matt. vi. 20, 32, and 'celestial Father,' xviii. 35. In Matt. xxvi. 17., we

have 'paschal supper;' in verse 19., 'passover.' 'He taught in their synagogues *with universal applause*,' (Luke iv. 14.,) is too much in Harwood's manner; and 'roared out,' (viii. 28.,) is not better than the 'bawled out' of Mace's version, which Campbell has so severely, but so very justly reprehended. 'My lads, have ye any victuals,' (John xxi. v.,) is not to be approved, though borrowed from Doddridge.

That there should not be an entire agreement of opinion among Biblical writers in respect to the manner in which a version of the Holy Scriptures should be executed, can scarcely appear surprising. It is, however, satisfactory to find so general a concurrence of the most able and judicious critics in favour of a literal translation. The sacred character of the Bible, and the high and solemn importance of its contents, impart to every form in which it is proposed to transmit it the greatest possible interest, and except it from the several kinds of compositions in reference to which a translator may be allowed his option. Every reader of the Bible should, as nearly as it may be practicable, be furnished with its pure and simple text. A version is, to the unlearned, to stand in the place of the original, and should therefore be as conformable to it as possible. It is not enough that the meaning of the sacred writers is conveyed by the translation: the forms and modes of expression in which their sentiments are exhibited, ought also to be preserved. It is frequently of the greatest importance to the correct understanding of the meaning of the sacred writers, that their characteristic and figurative expressions should be exhibited by a translator. Very minute attention, therefore, requires to be given by the author of a version of the Scriptures to the text of his original, as well as to the powers of the vernacular language into which he renders, that he may faithfully and exactly set before his readers the sentiments of the inspired writers in their genuine forms. Perspicuity and simplicity are indispensable requisites in a translation of the Bible, and should never be sacrificed, as they have sometimes been, by the affectation of novelty, and the indulgence of a vitiated taste.

Of the manner in which the Scriptures should be translated into our own language, the Public Version is an approved model; and nothing could be more easy than to extract from it passages which combine in the highest degrees the excellences of precision in sense, and simplicity and elegance in diction. It is with great propriety, therefore, that the most judicious translators have proposed to retain the words of the Public Version in all cases in which they correctly and perspicuously express the sense of the original. Dr. Boothroyd has not pro-

fessedly provided a 'New Translation of the Bible,' which would hold out the promise of an entirely original production; he has entitled his volumes an 'Improved Version,' which refers us to the Common Version, as the object on which his corrective labours have been employed. In the execution of this task, he has possessed the most ample advantages. So many are the attempts that have been made to amend the faults and to supply the deficiencies of the Public Version, and so numerous are the translations of the Scriptures, entire and in part, that have been published in our native language, that the Biblical Translator is furnished with the most abundant materials for the completion of his undertaking. In the judicious selection and skilful application of these materials, his judgement and taste will be fairly tried; and the merits of his work will be decided by the comparison which it must sustain with the versions of his predecessors, to which it must be indebted for the most considerable part of its improvements. Dr. Boothroyd has, in the present volume, made very ample use of the versions of former translators. There are but few of his deviations from the Public Version which may not be described as derived renderings. Campbell and Wakefield are laid under contribution; but we are glad to find that many of their characteristic renderings are rejected. Newcome is followed to a very considerable extent, where he varies from King James's Translators. The merit of the present Version will, of course, be in part determined by an examination of its critical structure, since it purports to be formed from 'corrected texts of the originals.' A work putting forward the claims of the Version before us ought to be, to the English reader, a representative of the Sacred text in the purest form in which it has been elicited by the critical labours of modern editors of the Greek New Testament. Dr. Boothroyd has evidently intended that his work should answer to the expectations of those who may be disposed to look to it as supplying the place of a revised critical edition of the original Greek text. He has, however, been less careful in consulting and applying his authorities than was necessary; and his 'corrected text' is less accurate and consistent than, with the advantages he possessed, was to be expected. In his adoption or rejection of readings, he does not appear to have been uniformly guided by the generally acknowledged canons of criticism. We occasionally meet with deviations from Griesbach's text, which we are not inclined to censure; but we cannot always approve of Dr. Boothroyd's variations from it, and are sometimes unable to perceive the reasons of his insertions and omissions.

In the first chapter of Matthew, ver. 8., Dr. Boothroyd has

added to the text the words, 'Ahaziah; and Ahaziah begot Joash; and Joash begot Amaziah; and Amaziah begot Uzziah;' and in verse 11th, the words 'Jehoiakim; and Jehoiakim begot.' Now, as no authority for these additions is to be derived from MSS. or other critical vouchers, some strong reasons in support of the assumption that they once formed a part of Matthew's initial chapter should have been produced, before they were restored to it as omissions. Griesbach does not insert them; and his canon, '*Nil mutetur e conjectura*, is so important, that we would not, even in such a case as the one before us, admit a conjectural emendation into any part of the New Testament. The marginal or the foot notes, are the proper place in which this kind of proposed readings should be noticed. In Chap. vi. 13, the doxology is retained in the text, included between brackets; and in the accompanying note, the reader is told, that 'Griesbach has rejected the doxology; and there is no doubt but it was added to the text from the Greek Liturgy.' The insertion and the note are completely at variance; and a passage which is thus decisively pronounced to be an interpolation, should not in any shape have found a place in a corrected text. In Chap. xi. 8, Griesbach is cited as omitting the words 'raise the dead,' but he only affixes to them the mark of probable rejection. The clause 'but deliver us from evil,' in Luke xi. 4, is omitted by Griesbach, as are also the preceding clauses—'who art in heaven,' and 'Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth.' The last two, Dr. Boothroyd has retained within brackets; the former he has inserted in the text without any mark; thus making an important difference where the authorities are the same, and without giving the reader any notice of the value of the readings. We shall notice very briefly a few additional examples of similar variation. At Matthew iv. 10, Dr. Boothroyd reads with the C. V., omitting '*behind me*,' which is inserted by Griesbach. V. 27.—'to the ancients,' B. Griesbach omits. Mark i. 2, 'In the prophets.' B. Griesbach reads 'In the prophet Isaiah.'—iii. 32, 'and thy sisters,' added to the text by Griesbach, is inserted by B., but without notice or mark. 1 Cor. xi. 28, the words, 'For the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,' rejected by Griesbach, are omitted without notice by Dr. Boothroyd.

The distribution of the contents of the books of Scripture into chapters, is an invention which, how useful soever in some respects, is, in others, much to be regretted. This arrangement is not the proper form in which the sacred writings should have been presented, but it has too long been established to be superseded, and cannot be discarded from copies intended

for popular use. In such cases, however, as admit of improvement, or which appear to require it in order that justice may be rendered to the descriptive and didactic parts of the Bible, a translator may be allowed to reform these divisions. Dr. Boothroyd will not be charged with wantonness or excess of innovation in this respect. The alterations which he has introduced in these divisions of the New Testament, are not numerous, but they are sometimes of real service to a reader.

A translator should not give to any part of his version the form of a paraphrase or commentary. The full sense of his author, he should convey in adequate terms; and Italics should never be employed by a translator in any case in which the words so distinguished are essential to the full expression of the sense of the original terms. In the public version, instances almost innumerable may be cited of this kind of impropriety; and a modern translator may render an acceptable service in correcting them. As Dr. Boothroyd's version is accompanied with notes, there is the less excuse to be made for his occasionally introducing into the text, terms in explanation of any part of it, which are unauthorized by the original. We have noticed several instances in which he has indulged in this liberty. For example: Matt. chap. i., v. 1. 'The genealogy and *life* of Jesus Christ.' Dr. Boothroyd has imperfectly distinguished the supplementary addition which he has introduced into this commencing sentence, there being no particle of conjunction in the original. The addition, he considers as included in the expression *Βίβλος γενέσεως*, which, to say the least, is very questionable. The phrase appears to be limited to the genealogy. The public version literally and properly renders—'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ;' with which agree Newcome, 'A table of the birth of Jesus Christ;' Campbell, 'The lineage of Jesus Christ;' and others. In Luke vi., v. 1. 'And it came to pass on the second sabbath *after the first day of unleavened bread.*' The words in Italics are no part of the Greek text; and as there is a variety of opinion in respect to the meaning of the compound term *δευτεροπρωτο*, this explanation should have been reserved for the notes. Acts vii., 1. 'Then said the high priest, *having heard the charge against Stephen,*'—is another instance of this kind.

We would not impose upon a Biblical translator the canon which has been laid down by some critics, that the same words and phrases of the original should invariably be rendered in the same way; but there are cases in which it is important that the version should present uniformity of rendering, and in which, where it is not preserved, the translator may lay himself open to the imputation of negligence and of very unne-

cessarily and improperly perplexing the reader. The Translators of the public version, in their address to the reader, remark, that they have 'not tied themselves to a uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words;' and add: 'Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places, (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where,) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*, if one where *journeying*, never *traveling*, if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c.—we thought to save our more of curiosity than of wisdom.' These are unobjectionable principles; but the benefit of them cannot be claimed for such variations as the following in Dr. Boothroyd's version. Matthew x. 28. 'a hundred *denarii*.' Luke vii. 41. 'five hundred *pence*.' Matthew xxv. 33. '*the Son of man* is near.' Mark xiii. 29. '*it* is near.' Matthew vii. 22. 'Master, Master.' xxv. 12. 'Sir, Sir.' Luke vi. 46. 'Lord, Lord.'

These remarks may be regarded as minute criticism, but the merits of an improved version of the Scriptures can neither be too minutely scrutinized, nor can they be estimated apart from its strict accuracy and consistency. We shall now, however, proceed to transcribe some connected passages from different portions of the present volume as fair specimens of the manner in which it is executed, leaving our readers to compare them with the same passages in the common version, and in such other translations as may be within their reach.

- ' Luke ii. 67. And his father Zechariah was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, saying, " Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; for he hath regarded and redeemed his people; And hath raised up a prince for our salvation, in the family of his servant David; (As he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been from ancient times;) Even a salvation from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; To perform the mercy promised, and to remember his holy covenant with our fathers; The oath which he swore to our father Abraham: To grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, In holiness and righteousness before him, all our days.
- ' And thou, child, shalt be called a prophet of the Most High: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; By giving the knowledge of salvation to his people, in the remission of their sins, Through the tender mercy of our God, by which a dawning light hath visited us from on high; To give light to those who sit in darkness and

in the shadow of death ; to guide our feet into the way of peace.'

22. ' Romans iii. 21. But now the righteousness *which is* of God
23. without *the works of the law* is manifested, being attested by
24. the law and the prophets ; Even the righteousness *which is* of
25. God by faith in Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all who believe ;
26. (for there is no difference : For all have sinned and fallen
short of the glory of God ;) Who are accounted righteous
freely, by his grace, through the redemption which is by
Christ Jesus : Whom God hath set forth a propitiatory offer-
ing, through faith in his blood, for the manifestation of his own
righteousness in respect to the remission of sins before com-
mitted, through the forbearance of God ; For the manifesta-
tion, at this time of his own righteousness, that he might be
righteous, and yet account righteous him who hath faith in
Jesus.'

19. ' Chap viii. 18. For I reckon that the sufferings of this pre-
sent time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which
shall be manifested to us. For the earnest expectation of
mankind waiteth for this manifestation to the sons of God :
20. (For mankind were made subject to vanity ; not willingly, but
21. through him who subjected the same,) In hope that mankind
will be delivered from this bondage of corruption into the
22. glorious freedom of the children of God. For we know that
all mankind groan and travail in pain together, until now :
23. And not only they, but ourselves also, who have the first
fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves,
looking for the adoption, *even* the redemption of our body.'

15, 16. ' 1 Cor. x. 14. Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from
idolatry. I speak as to wise men ; judge ye what I say. The
cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a common partaking of
the blood of Christ ? The loaf which we break, is it not a
17. common partaking of the body of Christ ? For as there is but
one loaf, so we, *though* many, are but one body : for we are all
18. partakers of that one loaf. Behold Israel according to the
flesh : are not they who eat of the sacrifices, common par-
19. takers of the altar ? What say I then ? that an idol is any
20. thing, or that an idol-sacrifice is any thing ? *Nay ; but I say,*
that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to
demons, and not to God : and I would not that ye should be
21. common partakers with demon-worshippers. Ye cannot drink
the Lord's cup and the cup of demons : ye cannot be par-
22. takers of the Lord's table, and of the table of demons. Do
we provoke the Lord to jealousy ?—are we stronger than he ?'

6. ' Phil. ii. v. For let this mind be in you which was in Christ
7. Jesus also. Who, existing in the form of God, did not think
it robbery to be equal with God, Yet made himself of no ac-
count, taking *on him* the form of a servant, being made in the
8. likeness of men ; And, being found in fashion as a man, he
humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even the death
of the cross.'

The reading, 'God,' in Acts xx. 28, is discarded by Dr. Boothroyd, but he does not adopt the reading for which Griesbach has exchanged it,—'the Lord,' and which has been received by many critics. He prefers the reading—'church of Him who is Lord and God,' as supported by the greatest number of MSS. collated, and as best accounting for the other variations. The latter position, we think very questionable; and, if the adopted reading be supported by the greater number of collated MSS., those MSS. are not either of the highest antiquity, or of the greatest value. In 1 Timothy iii. 16. Dr. Boothroyd retains the commonly received reading, 'God manifested in the flesh, &c.' He rejects the controverted passage, 1 John v. 7.

The volume before us, which completes Dr. Boothroyd's Translation of the Bible, comprises a very useful general Index to the Scriptures, and a topographical Index, which will be of essential service to every reader. These, with the Introduction prefixed to the first volume of the work, are most valuable additions to it. The notes to the New Testament are numerous, and will supply the place of a commentary, and the reflections are appropriate and well adapted for domestic or private use. We cannot, in concluding our notice of Dr. Boothroyd's labours, withhold our cordial commendation of his persevering diligence; and feeling, as we do, warmly interested in every well conducted attempt to promote Biblical studies and the intelligent use of the Scriptures, we congratulate him on the completion of his arduous undertaking. We shall be glad to find that he receives the patronage of the public to a gratifying extent, and recommend his 'Family Bible, and Improved Version' as a highly meritorious publication.

Art VI. *The Amulet; or Christian and Literary Remembrancer for 1827.* pp. 420. (Twelve Plates.) Price 12s. London. 1826.

THE first blossoming of this elegant *annual* was noticed in our number for December last. This year, it has blown rather earlier, taking the lead in this respect, whatever it may prove to do in others, of the rival forget-me-nots and other flowery publications which, when our parterres have lost their gayety, and green leaves all turn yellow, are coming into season. These publications, which form a sort of ready-made album, and of a kind which levy no imposition beyond the needful pecuniary fine upon the unwary reader,—these elegant literary pic-nics deserve, we think, to be encouraged. There is something sociable in this anniversary assemblage of the literati and the literatæ of the day; and something kindly and

liberal in their uniting with Messieurs the artists and engravers, to furnish this annual portfolio for the gratification of the public.

Of a miscellany so very miscellaneous, it is difficult to give any fair idea by a few extracts. There is the usual variety of lyric and narrative, of grave and gay, of lively—but not severe, although there is perhaps more than a due proportion of the pathetic. Professor Wilson has contributed, we perceive, a beautiful tale; and the “Author of *May you like it*,” has done himself no discredit by his affecting ‘story of the reign of Henry VIII.,’ entitled, ‘*Sir Arthur Woodgate*.’ There are some other very interesting tales, by Miss Mitford, Mrs. Hofland, and some anonymous hands; but the poetical department will furnish us with the most convenient specimens. We gave, as a specimen of the former volume, a poem by Mrs. Hemans, and we know not that we can do better than take the following poem, which has the same signature.

‘THE HOUR OF PRAYER.

‘ Child, amidst the flowers at play,
While the red light fades away;
Mother, with thine earnest eye,
Ever following silently;
Father, by the breeze of eve
Called thy harvest-work to leave;—
Pray!—Ere yet the dark hours be,
Lift the heart and bend the knee.

‘ Traveller, in the stranger’s land,
Far from thine own household band;
Mourner, haunted by the tone
Of a voice from this world gone;
Captive, in whose narrow cell
Sunshine hath not leave to dwell;
Sailor, on the darkening sea;—
Lift the heart and bend the knee!

‘ Warrior, that from battle won,
Breathest now at set of sun;
Woman, o’er the lowly slain,
Weeping on his burial-plain;
Ye that triumph, ye that sigh,
Kindred by one holy tie!
Heaven’s first star alike ye see—
Lift the heart and bend the knee!’

This is followed by a striking sonnet by Mr. Holland, which reminds us of an exquisite Italian one, translated by Mr. Montgomery: it is, however, if an imitation, an allowable and very happy one.

“Who shall avenge the slave?” I stood and cried:
“The earth, the earth!” the echoing sea replied.
I turned me to the ocean, but each wave
Declined to be the avenger of the slave.
“Who shall avenge the slave?” my species cry—
“The winds, the floods, the lightning of the sky:”
I turn’d to these,—from them one echo ran—
“The right avenger of the slave, is man!”—
Man was my fellow; in his sight I stood,
Wept, and besought him by the voice of blood:
Sternly he looked, as proud on earth he trod,
Then said, “The avenger of the slave is God!”—
I looked in prayer towards heaven—awhile ’twas still,
And then methought God’s voice replied—“I WILL!”

There is a very touching poem by Mrs. Gilbert, the last stanza of which is sadly marred by a provoking typographical blunder, which we do not copy.

‘THE FELON.

‘Child of dishonour, guilt, and shame,
Lone outcast from thy kind,
Whose passion’s rage no voice could tame,
Whose arm no law could bind,
That human breast, all fiend within,
And scorched and blackening still with sin,—
‘Where art thou? Does some shattered shed
Thy guilty haunt conceal?
There dost thou shake at human tread,
And dread the rattling wheel?
By night a wanderer pale and drear—
By day, a fear-worn tenant here?
‘Or dost thou from yon prison’s grate,
Send forth the fitful yell?
Condemned a few short hours to wait
Alive in that sad cell:
Then, with convulsive heave, to rend
This mortal curtain, and descend!
‘Poor child of woe! there was a day,
(O would it yet might be!)
When life unstained before thee lay,
All promise e’en to thee!
On its fair pages there was not
One hue of sin, one error’s blot.
‘A babe! to some fond mother’s side
With sweet affection prest;
Thy little crimson lips applied
For nurture to her breast;
Thy hands, then innocent as weak,
Spread on her bosom or her cheek.

' Yes, and I know that many a day
 She bathed thee with her tears,
 Delighted with the fond essay
 To plan thy future years;
 Or bleeding fast at sorrow's vein,
 At thought of life's sure coming pain.
 ' Early bereaved, perchance, on thee,
 Sole relic, she relied,
 To heal a widowed heart, and be
 Instead of one who died;
 And many a lonely night she spent
 By turns on him and thee intent.
 ' And didst thou in that opening prime
 Her dream of hope prolong?
 E'en then she saw thy germ of crime,
 But would not see *thee* wrong;
 Fearing, she hoped, from day to day,
 Till passion wrenched thee from her sway.
 ' Then darkly onward sped the years,
 That chilled thy heart to stone;
 And now no early friend appears,
 To soothe thy mortal groan;
 And she, of all thy friends the chief,
 Why comes she not?—She died of grief!
 ' Mother—if e'er a mother's eye
 This tale of truth beguile—
 O, turn thy watchful scrutiny
 E'en on thine infant's smile,
 And heed the prophecy of ill,
 Dark scroll, in childhood's rebel will.
 ' While bright the fateful pages stand
 Of life's unwritten book,
 Direct to one Almighty hand,
 Faith's oft-imploring look;
 And as the fair inscription shines,
 O strengthen thou the holy lines.'

The next paper to this is a sketch of the Crusade against the Albigenses, by the Rev. S. Gilly, who has honourably distinguished himself by his benevolent exertions on behalf of the suffering Vaudois. He has availed himself, we perceive, in drawing up this account, of the volume by M. Sismondi, which forms the subject of a preceding article in our present Number; and the readers of the *Amulet* may accept of our observations as in some measure supplementary to Mr. Gilly's narrative. We must not pass over an original and very interesting account of the Armenian Christians, furnished by the Rev. Dr. Walsh, late chaplain to the British Embassy at Constantinople. Of this

interesting remnant of a once powerful nation, whose country is the centre from which the population of the post-diluvian world diverged, but who now, like Israel and Judah, are scattered over the face of the Eastern world, little is known in this country. Tournefort has given an interesting account of his journey into Armenia, but he is almost the only modern traveller who has paid much attention to this people. It is computed that about a million still remain in the mountains of their native country. Constantinople and its vicinity contain about 200,000; Persia, 100,000; India, 40,000; Hungary and other parts of Europe, 10,000; Africa and America, 1,000. Total, 1,351,000. Of the Constantinopolitan colony, about 4000 have conformed to the Roman Catholic forms, and acknowledge the supremacy of the Romish See: the remainder adhere to their own patriarch. The following account of some of their customs and superstitions is highly curious.

Nor does the attachment of families cease with this life; for long after death, they endeavour to hold a visionary communication with their parents and children. The cemeteries of the people of the East are not, as with us, small and scattered in detached places through their cities: but there are large common receptacles for the dead outside their towns. In the vicinity of Constantinople, each nation has its own; and the Turks, Jews, Greeks and Armenians, form immense cities of the dead. That of the Armenians occupies a space of near a hundred acres, on a hill that overlooks the Bosphorus. The Turks, on the death of a friend, plant a young cypress over his grave; their burying-ground, therefore, consists of extensive groves of these trees, which they reserve exclusively to themselves. The Armenians generally plant on such occasions a tree which yields a resinous gum of a strong aromatic odour, which fills the air, and corrects the exhalations from the graves. They grow to a large size, and form very picturesque objects in a landscape. Their cemetery on the Bosphorus is covered with these trees, and, from its elevated situation, the view it commands, and the view it presents, is perhaps the most interesting grove in the world. Here, whole Armenian families, of two or three generations together, are constantly seen sitting round the tombs, and holding visionary communications with their departed friends. According to their belief, the souls of the dead pass into a place called *Gayank*, which is not a purgatory, for they suffer neither pain nor pleasure, but retain a perfect consciousness of the past. From this state they may be delivered by the alms and prayers of the living, which the pious Armenians give liberally for their friends. Easter Monday is the great day on which they assemble for this purpose: but every Sunday, and frequently week days, are devoted to the same object. The priest who accompanies them, first proceeds to the tombs, and reads the prayers for the dead, in which he is joined by the family. They then separate into groupes, or singly sitting down by favourite graves, call its inhabitants about them, and by the help of a

strong imagination, really seem to converse with them. This pious and pensive duty being performed with their dead friends, they retire to some pleasant spot near the place, where provisions had been previously brought, and cheerfully enjoy the society of the living. These family visits to the mansions of the departed are a favourite enjoyment of this people. I have frequently joined their groupings without being considered an intruder; and, I confess, I have always returned pleased, and even edified, by the pious though mistaken practice.

The island of Marmora lies almost within sight of this place, and abounds in marble; this stone is very cheap and abundant, and no other is used in erecting tombs. Some of these family mausolea are rich and well sculptured; others of them are very remarkably distinguished. The first thing that strikes a stranger, is a multitude of little cavities cut at the angles of the stone; these are monuments of Armenian charity. The trees abound with birds, who frequently perish for want of water in that hot and arid soil. These cups are intended to be so many reservoirs to retain water for their use, as they are filled by every shower of rain. The Armenians are fond of commemorating the profession of the dead; they therefore engrave on his tomb the implements of his trade, so that every one may know how he had gained his living; but the most extraordinary circumstance is, that they are also fond of displaying how he came by his death; you therefore see on their tombs the effigies of men sometimes hanging, sometimes strangled, and sometimes beheaded, with their heads in their hands. To account for this extraordinary fondness for displaying the infamous death of their friends, they say that no Armenian is ever executed for a real crime; but when a man has acquired a sufficient fortune to become an object of cupidity to the Turks, he is then, on some pretext, put to death, that his property may be confiscated; an executed man, therefore, implies only a man of wealth and consequence. This display is a bitter but just satire on Turkish justice, though the Turks are so stupid as not to comprehend it. I brought with me a worthy Armenian priest one day, who, with fear and trembling, translated for me the inscriptions on some of these tombs. I annex one as a sample:

‘ You see my place of burial here in this verdant field.

I give my Goods to the Robbers,
My Soul to the Regions of Death,
The World I leave to God,
And my Blood I shed in the Holy Spirit.

You who meet my tomb,

Say for me,

“ Lord, I have sinned.”

1197.

Notwithstanding this treatment, the Armenians are in higher favour with the Turks than any other tributary people. They designate the Greeks, whom they detest, “ Yesheer,” or “ Slaves,” and consider them so; the Jews, “ Musaphir,” or “ Strangers,” because they came from Spain; but the Armenians, “ Rayas,” or “ Subjects,” because their country is now a province of Turkey, and they consider them Asiatics, and a part of themselves. This favour is greatly en-

hanced by the wealth which the industry and enterprise of the Armenians bring to the impoverished and lazy Turks. They are, therefore, appointed to all those situations which the Turks themselves are incapable of filling. They are the Masters of the Mint, and conduct the whole process of coining money; they are the "Saraffs," or bankers, who supply government and individuals with cash in all their embarrassments; they are the conductors of the very few manufactures which exist in the empire; and they are the merchants who carry on the whole internal trade of Asia. They enjoy, however, a perilous protection: the very favour they are shewn is a snare for their destruction; for every man that acquires wealth by its means, knows that he holds his life only as long as the circumstance is unknown.

It is singular that the Armenians have never shewn the slightest sympathy or common feeling with their Christian brethren the Greeks. No Armenian has ever yet been found to join their cause, nor to assist it in any way, either by money or influence. Resembling Quakers, however, in many of their habits, they are, like them, a quiet, passive, sober people, and greatly averse to war. Besides this, there unfortunately exist some religious differences between them and the Greeks, which embitter their mutual feelings. The Greeks despise them for their timidity; and, arrogating to themselves exclusively the name of "Christians," they seem to exclude the Armenians from Christian community.

The Armenians, though fond of religious books, have little taste for, or acquaintance with, general literature. They purchase with great avidity all the Bibles furnished by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Their patriarch sanctioned and encouraged a new edition of the New Testament, which the Rev. Mr. Leeves, the agent of the Bible Society, has had printed at an Armenian press at Constantinople; and I was encouraged to have a translation made into their language, of some of the Homilies of our Church, on account of the Homily Society in London, which I left in progress. They had early a printing-office attached to the Patriarchate, and another more recently established by a private company at Korou Chesme, in the neighbourhood of Constantinople. They have also a third which was set up at the convent of St. Lazare, in Venice, from whence has issued a number of books in their language. Their publications are, however, almost exclusively confined to books on religious subjects. I obtained a list of all the books printed at the patriarchal press, from the year 1697, the year of its establishment, to the end of the year 1823. It conveys a better idea of the literary taste and progress of the Armenians, than any other document could do. In a space of a hundred and twenty-five years, only fifty-two books were printed, but of each of these several editions: Forty-seven of them were commentaries on the Bible, sermons, books of prayer, lives of saints, hymns, and psalters, and a panegyric upon the angels. The five not on sacred subjects, were, "An Armenian Grammar," a "History of Etchmeasin," a "Treatise on Good Beha-

viour," a "Tract on Precious Stones," and a "Romance of the City of Brass." ' pp. 55—60.

The Armenian language is read, like those of Europe, from left to right; but this is supposed to be a mode of writing adopted subsequently to their intercourse with Europeans, as 'no such writing is found on the coins or other ancient monuments of the country.' Its use is very limited. Dr. Walsh says, that he has met with many Armenians who could both read and write the Turkish and the Italian, but were unable to translate their own books. He intimates a sinister foreboding respecting their rivals the Greeks, which, we devoutly trust, will prove to be only the fears of a friend, not the predictions of an augur.

We can make room for only one more extract, and it must be Mr. Stebbing's beautiful poem entitled,

‘ THE CHANGE.

‘ My spirit was sad when evening fell
 Around my infant home;
 There was a voice that seemed to tell
 Of griefs that were to come—
 Of friends whose parting word should be
 A long and last farewell to me—
 Of change, forgetfulness, and woe,
 Blighting what hearts were left to glow.
 ‘ I stood—where years before I stood—
 Before that early home;
 The winter's whelming torrent-flood
 Had flung not there its foam;
 Nor there had war with crimson hand
 Hurl'd in his wrath the flaming brand;
 Nor pestilence nor famine raved,
 Nor tyranny the land enslaved.
 ‘ But there the hand of time had wrought
 That perishing change on all,
 Which leaves but for the brooding thought
 The ruin ere the fall;
 Making the heart's deep pulse to be
 A warning of eternity,
 And love for things of earth to seem
 The wasted music of a dream.
 ‘ The flowers had perished not, but grew
 Less floridly and bright;
 They had not that same living hue,
 That odorous breath of light,
 Which was around them when each stem
 Bloom'd for the hand that planted them,

And every thing beside was gay,
And full of young sweet health as they.

' And there were all the things the eye
Had registered within the breast,
Wearing the same reality,
But not the charm of old possessed ;
And where another's eye had seen
But little change in what had been,
To me, time seemed with quicker tread
His desolating hand to spread.

' My heart had borne the blight and storm,
The toil of many years ;
But there was round the darkest form
That woe or peril wears,
No gloom so deep as that which pressed
Heavily on the aching breast,
When hope its long-sought home surveyed,
And found each home-loved thing decayed.

' 'Tis not the retrospective glance
Adown the stream of years,
That makes us scorn the dizzy dance
Of earthly hopes and fears ;
It is the change of things we love
For their sakes who are now above—
The change of things whose forms are wrought
Into that linked chain of thought.'

We regret to notice several typographical inaccuracies. A stanza in the first page is ruined by the substitution of caves for coves.

' Farewell the wild coves of thy desolate shore,
Where the cliffs but re-echo the Triton's dread roar ;
But there the free bark the proud Pasha defies,
And the Mainote exults o'er his Mussulman prize.'

Taken as a whole, this elegant miscellany does great credit to the taste and spirit of the Editor. The embellishments are decidedly superior to those in the former volume, and are very beautifully executed.

Art. VII. 1. *Sermons*, delivered, chiefly, in the Chapel of the East India College. By the Rev. Charles Webb Le Bas, A.M. Professor of Mathematics, in the E. I. College, Hertfordshire. Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell, &c. 8vo. pp. 416. Price 10s. 6d. London. 1822.

2. *Seventeen Sermons*, by the Rev. Hugh McNeile, A.M. Rector of Albury, Surrey, Chaplain to H. E. the Lord Lieut. of Ireland, and to H. G. the Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. pp. 440. Price 12s. London. 1825.

3. *Parochial Sermons*, by the Rev. W. Wilson, D.D. Rector of Church Oakley, Hants, &c. 8vo. pp. 404. Oxford. 1826.

THE resurrection of pulpit eloquence within consecrated walls is a marked feature of the present times, and its consequences are already perceptible in the new moral impulse which has been communicated in many circles by this powerful organ. The church that neglects to avail itself of this means of influence, or that does not cherish and cultivate a genuine pulpit oratory, is as blind to its own interests as it is forgetful of its duty. Yet, till within comparatively a recent period, no preaching was to be heard within the Church of England that deserved the name. Any thing approaching to eloquence was tacitly proscribed and effectually discountenanced as partaking of the character of enthusiasm. This prejudice has not ceased to operate. It affords too convenient a protection for incapacity and indolence to be abandoned without reluctance. There is something in talent, in eloquence more especially, which savours of a republican independence, a democratic energy, hostile to the repose of privileged mediocrity, and subversive of the claims derived from precedence, routine, interest, and prescriptive right. Preaching is an appeal to the people, though it be in the character of an instructor. It requires a species of competency, for which our ancient seats of learning have neglected to provide. On these and other accounts, it has been regarded as unworthy the patronage of the powers of Church and State. Now and then, such a one as Horsley could break through the fashion of dullness; and in his hands, that most tame and inane thing, as it had become, the sermon, resumed, in some measure, its force and dignity. But such instances were rare and few; and the contrast, in respect to any display of mind, between the English bar and senate and the English Church, has been, and still continues to a great extent, most singular and striking.

What is to induce a man who depends for no portion of his income, consideration, or respectability upon any intellectual effort,—who may even offend those whose good opinion he

values, by any insurrection of talent against customary forms and usage,—who knows that his advancement will be impeded, rather than promoted by the semblance of fervour and zeal,—what is to induce him to waste his oil upon preparation for the pulpit, and to throw his serious efforts into a composition that is to perish with the utterance? We admit that other and purer motives ought to guide and animate the Preacher; but he may be very conscientious, and yet, may content himself with a very indolent discharge of his duty. We admit, too, that the conversion of the sinner and the regeneration of the heart, are not to be accomplished by the efficiency of human eloquence or man's wisdom. But preaching is, as Hooker terms it, 'the blessed ordinance of God,' the most powerful instrument ever devised for ruling, and instructing, and softening the minds of men. It may be abused and misdirected, but the interests of society cannot be promoted by its being reduced to a nullity through the trammels of a false taste, and a dull, heartless formality. We rejoice, then, unfeignedly, that there are appearances of its assuming new life and energy in the pulpits of the Establishment, even though it should prove disadvantageous—and it will be their own fault if it does—to the cause of the Dissenters. That the multitudes who attend the parish church should be effectively taught, is a consideration that might serve to reconcile us even to a slight diminution of the numbers who attend upon what we may deem the more evangelical ministry. But this diminution will not take place, except as Dissenters suffer themselves to fall behind in the genuine qualifications of the Christian pastor and instructor.

From among a number of volumes, with the multiplication of which we find it impossible to keep pace, we have selected these three, as seeming to claim, though on different grounds, distinct notice. The first of the three has been for some time before the public, but as it had escaped our notice, it will probably be new to most of our readers. It belongs to a class of pulpit compositions, with which we are assuredly not overstocked,—sermons excellently, though not exclusively, adapted to the higher classes. These were for the most part addressed to the young men in the East India College; and though not originally designed for publication, have evidently been composed, as the Author states, 'under a deep and constant sense of the solemn responsibility attached to the office of training men to fulfil a momentous destination in this life, and to stand before the presence of their God in that which is to come.' The Sermons are fraught with the most important instruction, conveyed in a style uniformly chaste, perspicuous, and unaffected, and not unfrequently rising into a most im-

pressive strain of eloquent solemnity. Nothing could be more appropriate or striking, especially considering the Preacher's audience, than the whole tenor of the fourth sermon. The text is Prov. xiv. 9. "Fools make a mock at sin." We transcribe the close of the discourse.

— 'This caution is the more indispensable, because, in the earlier periods of life, the detestable effects of sin are seldom brought home to the conviction by personal observation and experience. The youthful mind is, generally, ignorant of the havoc which profligacy and ungodliness are hourly making with the peace of mankind. Wickedness, we know, is the parent of misery; but with misery, youth is but little conversant. Sin, therefore, unless it appear in the shape of some atrocious enormity, some act of open hostility against the established order of human society, is too apt to strike young persons as nothing more than a pardonable compliance with the inclinations of a nature which rejects all moral perfection as chimerical. They are consequently tempted to believe that the exact measure of indulgence can never be so important a matter as they find it represented in systems of religion and morality. They suspect that the censures of grave and pious men are dictated by a spirit of uncharitable exaggeration. Where a soul, long familiar with heavenly things, perceives a deadly provocation of the Divine Lawgiver, they see little but the venial lapses of human frailty. This want of solemn impression, unhappily, leaves the mind sufficiently disengaged to seek amusement in all the grotesque distortions of the human character; in all the curious doublings and mazes of its deviation from rectitude; in the thousand ludicrous accompaniments which so frequently relieve the most odious forms of transgression, converting the world into a motley assemblage, and imparting to life a sort of dramatic effect and variety. Hence, the very excesses of vice are, to them, fruitful in mirth and diversion. The worst obliquities of character may perhaps excite their contempt, but can scarcely ever awaken their sorrow. They are able to extract merriment from almost every infraction of morality, that does not entail positive infamy, or produce immediate and calamitous results. In short, they consider wickedness chiefly in its fantastic and extravagant exhibitions; seldom in its remote and penal consequences. Such is the levity natural to characters as yet untutored by reflection, experience, or suffering! How awful then must be the danger of suffering it to remain uncorrected! To what a condition must that mind be hastening, which has never beheld sin in a formidable, or even serious shape: which has remained a stranger to its deformity; has been accustomed to treat it as a laughable weakness, and to scoff at all anxiety for its extirpation! By perseverance in such a course of pernicious trifling, a man may sooner or later deprive all solemn motives of any hold upon his conscience. He may utterly cut off all retreat from the dwellings of ungodliness to the peace and joy of the kingdom of heaven. He may even destroy within himself every wish for deliverance from his wretched captivity: and when this is the case, to all human apprehension the man is lost;

and nothing can recover him but the mighty and especial working of God's Holy Spirit.

And where, under heaven, can be found a sight more dreadful than that of an immortal soul approaching the confines of eternity in this state of alienation from the love or fear of God? Let those who in early life are tempted to treat sacred things with derision, consider well the extremity to which the habit may lead them. Let them contemplate the aged scorner, that most hateful of fools, who, having survived his lusts, still cherishes the memory of their dominion; whose imagination still clings to evil, till at last he becomes a fanatic in the cause of licentiousness and irreligion, and delights to stifle, with fiend-like mockery, the scruples of hesitating and unpractised vice. This is a spectacle which even youth itself can scarcely look upon without loathing and contempt. There is in that age an instinct which, in the wildest delirium of pleasure, still perceives that gravity and holiness are the appropriate ornaments of the old; and that "the hoary head is a crown of glory," only "if found in the way of righteousness." The loosest votary of youthful indulgence feels, that irreverent sarcasm is odious in the mouth of decrepitude: he shrinks from the exhibition as from something monstrous and unnatural. Let him then remember that he has before him an exact picture of the degradation that must ultimately await him, unless he seasonably bursts the spell of this unhallowed folly. He may see his own future shame portrayed in the person of one, whose boast it is that, on the verge of the grave, at the very threshold of eternity, he can occupy, unconcerned, the "seat of the scornful." The spectacle of such depravity is well fitted to awaken the soul to "the terrors of the Lord," who hath "prepared judgements for scorers, and stripes for the backs of fools;" and thus, by their dreadful example, even the reprobate themselves may be compelled to minister to his glory.

pp. 86—90.

There is a very striking sermon against profaneness, founded on Deut. xxviii. 58, 9., in the course of which the Preacher remarks, that 'numbers may trace the subversion of their principles to that unblest license of tongue which gradually robs every thing serious and holy of its command over the affections.' And he places this sin in a very awful but not less just point of view, when he suggests the reflection, whether there is not some alliance between this practice of degrading the Majesty of Heaven by trifling and irreverent allusion, and that sin which has been pronounced by our Lord himself beyond all hope of pardon. Equally solemn and impressive is the next discourse, on the danger of an imperfect repentance, illustrated by the allegory of the demoniac, Matt. xii. 45. Professor Le Bas rejects the usual interpretation of the parable, which applies it to the Jewish nation as a body, as not corresponding to the fact, as not likely to be understood by our Lord's hearers in so refined a meaning, and as incumbered

with other difficulties. His exposition of the passage will, we think, strongly incline the reader to the same opinion. Sermon XI. has for its object, to inculcate the principle of a 'religious patriotism' on those who have before them the prospect of removal to a distant country: it is founded on Psalm cxxii. 6—9., and is altogether a beautiful application of the passage. In Sermon XIII., on the office of the Divine Paraclete, the Author, without any parade of criticism, shews himself to be an able and judicious expositor, and at the same time, in the practical use which he makes of the subject, not less the faithful and evangelical minister. Towards the close of the discourse, after shewing that the language in which the agency of the Holy Spirit is spoken of, is utterly incompatible with the notion that it formed only a temporary and perishable part of the Christian dispensation, the Preacher proceeds:—

'We may, then, rest safely in the assurance that, as mankind have still in heaven an intercessor to plead for them with the Divine Majesty, even the everlasting Son of God; so has the cause and the doctrine of the Redeemer still an advocate on earth, even the Spirit of grace and consolation, who shall maintain and defend the truth against the "prince of this world" unto the end of time.

'If, then, these things be so; if the eternal and infinite Spirit, with mysterious condescension, still vouchsafes to plead with sinful men, and to sustain the office of working their conviction as to those things which belong to their peace; with what grateful humility should we surrender ourselves to his guidance! If we sincerely desire to enjoy the benefits of his blessed ministry, we must be careful to maintain a temper and a deportment suited to the majestic character and presence of that heavenly agent. They only are the sons of God, and heirs of his kingdom, who are led by the Spirit of God; who give themselves up to his direction, and obey his holy impulses; for, that the power to disobey those impulses is left us, appears from the urgent exhortations which we find in Scripture to avoid the guilt and danger of resisting and grieving the Spirit of God, by which we are sealed to the day of redemption.'

—'How should we tremble lest the temple should become desecrated, and should finally be abandoned by its heavenly inhabitant! It is impossible to imagine a more awful incitement to vigilance against the first access of sinful purposes, than the reflection that we are thus doing despite to the Spirit of grace; that we may thus, at last, provoke him to desert for ever the contaminated abode; to surrender it to abominations wilfully contracted; and to convert it, from a favoured sanctuary, into a monument of wrath! Let us, then, jealously maintain and fortify all those sacred principles of right, which are appointed to guard the avenues of the heart, and to repel the invasion of evil. If ever it should, by stealth, or sudden assault, gain admittance, and commence its unholy solicitings,—let us remember that the Divine Advocate is at hand to rebuke and to de-

feat them. He will not fail us, if we are but true to Him and to ourselves. Let us therefore, on such occasions, instantly turn our attention to those unutterable pleadings, with which He is ready, at all times, to convince us of the evil and danger of sin. He will speak to us in the accents of conscience; he will bring the words of Divine truth to our remembrance; he will quicken and illuminate our understandings; he will, by some mode or other, so work in us, as to make us inexcusable if he works in vain. It is for us, therefore, "having such promises, to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord." It is ours to watch and pray incessantly, that so we may lose no portion of the sanctifying virtue, and that we may escape the danger of vexing the Holy Spirit, and of converting that mighty vindicator of the truth into an adversary against us. For it must be remembered, that should he in vain convince us of sin,—that is, if our conviction should be without reformation,—the controversy must end in our being "convinced of judgement," and made partakers of that condemnation which is decreed against the prince of this world.' pp. 313—18.

The ensuing sermon, on the testimony of St. Paul, is one of the most eloquent and beautiful in the volume. To persons who, like the Galatian teachers, have taken up disparaging notions respecting the character and Divine mission of that wonderful man, as Professor Le Bas justly styles him, this masterly vindication of the validity and force of his testimony may be strongly recommended, as adapted to satisfy every ingenuous inquirer. It will not admit, however, of any detached extract. Sermons xv. and xvi. on Psalm cx. 4. and Heb. iv. 14, 15. were preached before the University of Cambridge: they will be read with interest as an instructive and highly practical exposition of the doctrine of the priestly office of Christ. The extracts we have given will, however, sufficiently recommend the volume. As compositions, these Sermons will be seen to rank very far above the average level: they are worthy of the scholar, and equally creditable to the Author as a divine. They read well, and interest in the perusal. To young men, especially to those who are leaving the country, no sermons could be more appropriate.

Mr. M'Neile's volume bears the stamp of native eloquence of a different kind,—his style is more impassioned, fervent, and declamatory. These Sermons must have been highly impressive, we make no doubt, in the delivery; the more so, from the colloquial freedom by which they are characterized, and for which, in a general way, we are well content to sacrifice some of the appropriate graces and finish of written composition. They are designed to be plain and popular, and they are bold, uncompromising, and faithful, without aiming at the severer qualities of profound theological knowledge or critical research.

They are, as might be expected, unequal, and the phraseology is sometimes peculiar; but the deep-toned and affectionate earnestness of the preacher, added to the evangelical purity of his sentiments, will secure for the volume the warm approbation of the religious public. The following specimen, taken nearly at random, will give our readers a fair idea of its merits.

‘My dear friends, the days of the years of your lives are few: I counsel you to seize upon the life-boat, now while it is called to-day; now while the gospel is preached in your ears; now while the Saviour waits and knocks for admittance to your hearts. “Behold now is the appointed time: behold now is the day of salvation. To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.” You have provoked God, who can tell how often? Awake memory, conscience awake, open the book of your past life once again, look, read: you had many advantages and opportunities; you had the Holy Scriptures since your childhood; you received many warnings by sickness, by the death of friends, by the loss of property; you felt and stifled the reproving voice of conscience a thousand and a thousand times; you have profaned the holy temple of the Lord of Hosts, attending it for form sake, or custom sake, or curiosity sake, instead of devotion, sitting in it as a self-complacent critic, instead of a self-condemned sinner; you have disgraced the holy sabbath of the Lord of Hosts doing your own works, writing your own letters, settling your own accounts: some of you absenting yourselves from his worship and joining with your wicked companions to take advantage of that time of rest to work uncleanness with greediness; and whereas the lawful occupations of the week prove some restraint upon you, it may truly be said, that the sabbath, instead of God’s day, has been in a peculiar degree, the devil’s day with your souls: you have harboured, indulged, recalled impure and licentious imaginations; you have joined in idle, yea, foul conversation; you have sung obscene songs, you have outraged female delicacy; nay, some of you have gloried in your shame, making a boast of your adulteries and fornications; these things have been your delight: again and again before you retired to rest at the time you should have been reading your Bibles or on your knees before God, you have been like true brethren of Belial busy in your father Beelzebub’s work of lust; you have dishonoured your parents and superiors; you have deceived, and defrauded, and slandered your neighbours; all this you have done through the evil days of the years of your lives, and God is a just God, and God is angry with the wicked every day, God is also a powerful God, able in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye to execute his just judgements against his enemies, “None can stay his hand.” Proud hardened sinners live and speak as though they defied God, they harden their necks, *they rush* as Eliphaz the Temanite describes them, *upon the thick bosses of the Almighty’s buckler*. But what are they like? They are like heaps of chaff preparing to stand against the whirlwind: they are like nests of ants climbing one upon another into a pile to resist the progress of a waggon

wheel: they are like groups of lunatics hanging out curtains towards the east to hide from the world the light of the rising sun. Ye fools, and blind, why will you fight against God? How can you resist God? Where can you fly from God? You will lie down presently in the grave, but darkness cannot cover you, darkness and light to God are both alike; you will call upon the rocks and hills and mountains to fall upon you and hide you from his wrath, but rocks, hills and mountains fly at his command, and leave the sinner naked in the hands of an angry God. Consider my dear perishing fellow sinners: with eager reiterated earnestness I beseech you in the name of God most high to consider your deplorable condition. A just God has given you a holy law, which during all the days of the years of your life you have broken, for each transgression you deserve damnation, you have broken each of the ten commandments a thousand times, you justly deserve ten thousand times damnation. Hell is ready. The devil is upon the watch. Why are you not plunged into the gulf? Because God sustains you, the God whom you have offended, the powerful God, the just God, the angry God, even he still keeps you up, he still keeps your lungs in play, your blood in motion, he still suspends the stroke of his justice. Nay more, he raises in your ears the voice of mercy, he proclaims himself a Saviour! willing to receive you, helpless sinner as you are, to blot out all your iniquities, to forgive you freely, to establish you upon a rock, to clothe you in the righteousness of Jesus Christ his dear Son, and make you a partaker of everlasting glory.' pp. 29—32.

The third volume on our list comprises six and twenty short and familiar 'parochial sermons:' the epithet by which the Author has designated them, sufficiently describes their specific character. They have about them a certain air of the old school, which is in striking contrast with the respective styles of the other volumes. It is not, however, for the purpose of either contrast or comparison, that we have placed them together, but with a view to recommend them severally, though on distinct grounds, as widely differing in every thing but doctrinal sentiment, to the notice of our readers. The first of these volumes reads best, and is most adapted to private perusal; with the contents of the second, perhaps, the *hearer* would be best pleased; the sermons in the third will be found best suited to domestic or parochial use. Dr. Wilson's name is known to our readers as the Editor of the admirable little selections from Leighton and Owen which have received our cordial recommendation. It seems scarcely necessary to give a specimen of the present volume; but, lest we should be thought wanting in respect towards either the esteemed Author or our readers, we insert a characteristic paragraph, taken from the seventh sermon, on Zech. iv. 6.

* Do not mistake the influence of religion generally, or of truth as such, for the power of the Spirit. You may feel, in a certain sense, this influence, and be interested with the truth, while you are not led by the Spirit. If these have *no* influence over you, you are indeed without hope; but you should not rest in feeling on these points what others feel not. Your minister can have no satisfaction in the effect of any of his labours among you, but in those which are clearly accompanied with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power: and his prayer for you is—that he may be the means of promoting your real spiritual interests—that when we separate and depart from this house of God, we may each retire with a heart deeply impressed with eternal things.....But whatever may be the visible effect of his ministry among you, he knows that success is of God only, nor does he hope that any adequate knowledge of it can ever be attained in this life. Let the day of judgement reveal it.

* Do not look for that which is extraordinary in religion. Some who do not profit as they ought or would desire, instead of humbly waiting upon God, and praying to be led by the Spirit, are looking out for something out of the ordinary course to set them right, and to give them fresh earnestness. They expect, for instance, to be assured in some way, rather than by what God has said in his word, of the pardon of sin; or to feel some powerful impression in respect to their state in the sight of God. Or, as soon as they enter on a profession, they would at once pass into all that light, and knowledge, and comfort, and rejoicing of hope, which can only be attained in proportion as they grow in other gifts and graces of the Spirit. Nothing is so safe, so conducive to spiritual profit, as a state of simple dependence on God, and a life of faith on the Son of God.'

pp. 99, 100.

We shall take an early opportunity of noticing several volumes of sermons from the pens of congregational ministers.

ART. VIII. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

We are requested to state, that the long-promised Romance, "Paul Jones," by Allan Cunningham, the well-known author of "Sir Marmaduke Maxwell," &c. is on the eve of publication.

Next month will be published, in one handsome pocket volume, with engravings on steel by James Mitchell, from drawings by J. M. Wright, Specimens of Sacred and Serious Poetry, from Chaucer to the present day; including the Sabbath, &c. of Graham, and Blair's Grave. The whole illustrated by Biographical Notices and Critical Remarks. By John Johnstone.

Mr. Tennant, the Author of "Anster Fair," has nearly ready for press, a work entitled, "Papistry Stormed; or, the Dingin Down o' the Cathedral."

Nearly ready, in one volume 12mo. Discourses on the Duties and Consolations of the Old. By the Rev. Dr. Belfrage, Falkirk, Author of "A Monitor to Families; or, Discourses on some of the Duties and Scenes of Domestic Life," &c.

In a few days will be published, in 8vo., Mathematical and Astronomical Tables, for the Use of Students in Mathematics, Practical Astronomers, Surveyors, Engineers, and Navigators; with an Introduction, containing the Explanation and Use of the Tables, illustrated by numerous Problems and Examples. By William Galbraith, M.A. Teacher of Mathematics in Edinburgh.

Early in November will be published, The Revolt of the Bees, a tale, in prose.

In the press, A Sequel to the Diversions of Purley; containing an Essay on English Verbs, with Remarks on Mr. Tooke's Work, and on some Terms employed to denote Soul or Spirit. By John Barclay.

In the press, A Memoir of Miss Frances A. Bell. By the Rev. Jofuson Grant, M.A.

In the press, "Death on the Pale Horse," a treatise illustrative of Rev. vi. 8. By the Rev. John Bruce of Liverpool.

Mr. Churchill, Surgeon, is preparing for the press, a second edition of his treatise on Acupuncturation, which will be illustrated by many additional cases of its successful application.

Mr. James Jennings has already for the press, Ornithologia, or the Birds: a poem, in two parts; with an Introduction to their Natural History, and copious Notes. The work will form an 8vo. volume, price to Subscribers, 12s.

A New Weekly Publication, entitled, The Parliamentary Reporter, will appear on the Meeting of Parliament.

On the eve of publication, The Story of a Wanderer; founded upon his Recollections of Incidents in Russian and Cossack Scenes. In one volume, post 8vo.

Also, Thoughts on Domestic Education, the Result of Experience. By a Mother, Author of "Always Happy," "Claudine Huitson," "The Sources of Happiness, &c." Post 8vo.

ART. IX. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Lindley Murray; in a Series of Letters, written by Himself, with a Portrait and Fac-simile of his Writing. 8vo. 9s.

EDUCATION.

Rudiments of the Greek Language; English and Greek: for the Use of the Edinburgh Academy. In 1 vol. 12mo. 4s. bound.

Elements of Arithmetic on a new Plan. By the Rev. Ingram Cobbin, A.M. Author of Grammar for Children. 1s. 6d.

HISTORY.

The History of the Reign of Henry the Eighth; comprising the Political History of the commencement of the English Reformation: being the First Part of the Modern History of England. By Sharon Turner, F.A.S. R.A.L. 1 vol. 4to. 2l. 2s.

The History of England, during the Middle Ages; comprising the Reigns from William the Conqueror to the accession of Henry VIII., and also the History of the Literature, Poetry, Religion, the Progress to the Reformation, and of the Language of England during

that Period. By Sharon Turner, F.A.S.
R.A.L. Second Edit. 5 vols. 8vo. 3l.

MEDICINE.

On Galvanism, with Observations on its Chymical Properties and Medical Efficacy in Chronic Diseases, with Practical Illustrations. Also, Remarks on some Auxiliary Remedies, with Plates. By M. La Beaume, Medical-Galvanist, Surgeon-Electrician, Consulting Ditto to the London Dispensary, Gratuitous Ditto to the Bloomsbury and Northern Dispensaries, F.L.S. &c. 7s.

A Treatise on Cancer; comprising several cases of Cancer in the Breast, Lip, Face, &c. cured by a mild method of practice that immediately alleviates the most acute pain. By T. Graham, M.D. Member of the Royal College of Surgeons.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Notes and Reflections during a Ramble in Germany. 8vo. 12s.

Minutes of the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, relating to the publication of an Edition of the Holy Scriptures, with an Introduction prefixed, by the Strasburg Bible Society, in the Year 1819; accompanied by the Official Correspondence which took place upon the subject. To which is added, the particulars of the Expenditure of the British and Foreign Bible Society during the last Year; with Observations thereon, by the Auditors. 8vo. 1s.

An Essay on Craniology; being the substance of a Paper submitted to the Philosophical and Literary Society, Leeds, December 2, 1825. By Richard Winter Hamilton, one of its Vice-Presidents. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Alongshore; or, the First Annual Retrospect of the London Mariner's Church and Rivermen's Bethel Union; interspersed with a variety of interesting anecdotes, and containing more informa-

tion respecting Sailors, Rivermen, and Boatmen, than has hitherto met the public eye. 6d.

A Narrative of the Loss of the Maria Mail Boat; and the Melancholy Wreck of the Wesleyan Missionaries at the Island of Antigua. 2d.

POETRY.

Anne Boleyn: a Tragedy. By Henry Montague Groves, St. Peter's College, Cambridge. 8vo. 5s. 6d. sewed.

Klopstock's Messiah: translated into English Verse. Vol. II. This volume completes the poem. 10s. 6d.

Select Specimens of English Poetry, from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to the present time; with an Introduction. By George Walker, M.A. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Head Master of the Grammar School, Leeds. One thick vol. 12mo. 9s.

THEOLOGY.

A short Statement of the Reasons for Christian, in opposition to Party Communion. By Robert Hall, A.M. 8vo. 2s.

The Christian contemplated; in a Series of Lectures. By the Rev. Wm. Jay. 8vo. 12s.

Sermons for Families. By the Rev. Wm. Brown. Vol. II. 10s. 6d.

The Shadow of Life: a Sermon occasioned by the lamented Death of Mrs. Lyon, wife of Capt. George Lyon, R.N. one of the Daughters of the M. N. House of Leinster. By the Rev. James Churchill, Thames Ditton.

A Guide to Acquaintance with God. By the Rev. James Sherman.

Sermons on Various Subjects, by the late Rev. John Hyatt, of London. Edited by his Son, Charles Hyatt. To which is prefixed, a Memoir of the Author by the Rev. John Morison, Minister of Trevor Chapel, Brompton. 8vo. 10s. 6d.